

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-240

CONTENTS

15 December 1987

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Underground Military Nuclear Test Reported	1
Nuclear Explosions for Oil Exploration Noted	1
Vienna Conventional Arms Talks Continue	1
U.S. Tests Tracking, Control System for SDI	1
U.S. Stance Toward Rarotonga Treaty 'Unchanged'	1
Leningrad Citizens Cited on Disarmament	2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Honecker Gives Speech at Warsaw Pact Dinner [PRAVDA 12 Dec]	3
---	---

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Pyadyshev Addresses Press Conference 15 Dec	4
Discusses INF Treaty	4
Describes Poll on Summit	4
Talks With UN's Cordovez	4
Vorontsov, UN's Cordovoz Discuss Afghanistan	4
NATO Reappraising Relations After INF Treaty	5
PRAVDA Views NATO Backing for Missile Treaty [Yu. Kharlanov, 13 Dec]	5
Socialist International Hails INF Accord	6
USSR Peace Committee Secretary on Developments	6
Soviets, Hungarians Demand Civil Rights [Vienns DIE PRESSE 11 Dec]	6
OPEC Meeting Unable To Agree on Quotas, Prices	7
PRAVDA Review of Weeks International Events [B. Averchenko, 13 Dec]	7
'International Situation—Questions & Answers' [Surguchev, Bogdanov, Andrianov, Korshunov]	9

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

Gorbachev Speaks on Results of Summit [PRAVDA 15 Dec]	14
Gorbachev Predeparture News Conference Reported [PRAVDA 12 Dec]	16
Reagan Lauds INF Treaty, Continues SDI	27
Reagan, Shultz Confident of Ratification [PRAVDA 14 Dec]	27
Shultz, Romanians Cited on Missile Treaty [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Dec]	27
IZVESTIYA Editorial: 'Hopes Justified' [14 Dec]	28
Gorbachev Impact on U.S. Public Weighed [PRAVDA 12 Dec]	29
Kornilov on Western Reaction to INF Treaty	30
PRAVDA Comparisons on Official Statements	31
Reagan 9 Dec Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	31
Gorbachev 9 Dec Dinner Speech [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	31
Joint Statement on Verification [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	31
Further Press Reportage on Summit Events	32
Gorbachev to 'Intelligentsia' [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	32
Gorbachev Meets With Media Men [PRAVDA 11 Dec]	35

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Shultz Against Nonnuclear Northern Europe [Kharkov]	39
Defense Budget Reduced for 'Political Reasons'	39
Tolkunov's 30 Nov Meeting With U.S. Visitors [IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]	39

Kachanov on Joint Ventures With U.S. Firms	40
Claims Over Journalists in DRA 'Groundless' [Kornilov]	40
Briefs	41
U.S. UN Association Visits	41

Northeast Asia

Adamishin Briefs Japanese on Summit Results [KYODO]	41
USSR-Japan Fail To Conclude Fishing Agreement [KYODO]	42
Tokyo 'Washes Its Hands' of KAL Incident [PRAVDA 14 Dec]	42
ROK Opposition Warns Against Election Fraud	43
New Ambassador to DPRK Presents Credentials	43
MPR's Namsray Hails Signing of INF Treaty	43

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Asia-Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Concept Viewed [Ivanov]	43
Antinuclear Trend in ASEAN Hailed	44
Commentary Notes Improved Ties With Thailand	45
PRK's Hun Sen Reports on Talks With Sihanouk	46
UN Committee Working on Micronesia Report	46
VNA, Soviet Press Agencies Cooperation Viewed	46
Briefs	47
Soviet TV to Australia	47

Near East & South Asia

DRA's Najibullah Welcomes Signing of INF Treaty	47
400 Afghans Return Home; 600 Lay Down Arms	47
Soviet View of Iran's Stand on DRA Noted	47
Factors Favoring, Impeding Near East Parley [V. Peresada in PRAVDA 13 Dec]	48
U.S.-Israeli Position Blocks Mideast Conference [Shabayev]	49
USSR Presidium, UAE President Exchange Cables [IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]	49
USSR Presidium Sends Thanks to Omani Sultan [Muscat]	49
Processes in Post-Bourguiba Tunisia Examined [V. Neznamov in IZVESTIYA 11 Dec]	50
Libya Resolutely Denies Planning To Attack Chad	51

East Europe

Minister Yazov Visits USSR Troops in GDR [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]	51
SFRY President Cables Gorbachev, Reagan [PRAVDA 11 Dec]	51
Trade Protocol With Poland Signed [PRAVDA 11 Dec]	52
Kharchenko-Led CPSU Delegation Visits Poland [PRAVDA 13 Dec]	52
Prague Ceremony Launches Gorbachev Book in CSSR [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 13 Dec]	52
Romania's Vaduva Holds Talks With Aristov [AGERPRES]	52
RCP Executive Committee Examines Economics [PRAVDA 13 Dec]	52

West Europe

French Minister's Criticism of INF Treaty Hit [PRAVDA 13 Dec]	53
Talks on U.S. Presence in Spain 'May Be Put Off'	53
DPA's 'Sensational' Journalism Criticized [V. Ponomarev in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Dec]	53
Economic Minister Bangemann Departs Moscow [DPA]	55

Latin America & Caribbean

Chile's United Left Releases Communique	55
Panamanian Envoy on U.S. Plans 'To Kill' Noriega	56

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Sakharov Calls for Afghanistan Pullout	[MOSCOW NEWS No 49]	58
Zaykov Addresses Moscow Gorkom Plenum	[MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA 6 Dec]	58
Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kiev Gorkom Plenum	[IZVESTIYA 13 Dec]	61
Volyn Obkom Bureau Scored at Plenum	[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 12 Dec]	64
Udmurt Leaders Scored for Law, Order Work	[PRAVDA 8 Dec]	66
Saratov Officials Jailed for Bribe-Taking	[PRAVDA 8 Dec]	68
'Civic Stance,' Exposure of Abuses Needed	[PRAVDA 6 Dec]	68
Problems in Forming Plant Councils Discussed		
	[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 1 Dec]	69
Hundreds Fight North Caucasus Pipeline Fire	[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Dec]	71
Briefs		72
Satellite TV in Pamirs		72
Belorussian Magazine		72

Agricultural

Chelyabinsk Taken to Task Over Stockraising	[PRAVDA 4 Dec]	72
Pension for Kolkhoz Members Increased	[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]	74

Scientific

'Cosmos-1901' Satellite Launched		75
Activities on 'Mir' Space Station Detailed		75

Underground Military Nuclear Test Reported

LD130425 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0415 GMT 13 Dec 87

[Text] 13 Dec (TASS) [dateline as received]—TASS announcement:

An underground nuclear explosion of between 20 and 150 kilotons was carried out at a testing ground near Semipalatinsk in the Soviet Union at 0620 Moscow time on 13 December.

The test was carried out for the purpose of improving military technology.

Nuclear Explosions for Oil Exploration Noted

LD140954 Moscow World Service in English
0800 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet Union this year conducted several underground nuclear explosions to study the possibility of increasing output of oil and gas in the layers which are hard to reach when using drilling equipment. The blasts were conducted in Yakutiya where there are many such deposits. A representative of the Ministry of Geology, Aleksey Zolotov, said in a press interview the explosions were conducted at a big depth and in hermetically sealed wells. That excluded radioactive particules leaking into underground water or escaping into the atmosphere.

Vienna Conventional Arms Talks Continue

LD142309 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1640 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] Vienna, 14 Dec (TASS)—The latest meeting took place today within the framework of the consultations between the countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO with the aim of working out a mandate for talks on reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Both sides pointed to the historic significance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Washington. The importance was also noted of those provisions in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement that point to the need for a rapid transition to a specific examination of problems of reducing conventional arms. The USSR delegation laid special stress on M.S. Gorbachev's idea—that after reaching a position where INF missiles are to be destroyed, questions of conventional weapons have begun to figure and they have taken center stage.

Those participating in the consultations agreed on a text for the section of the mandate that defines the aims of the future talks. These consist in strengthening stability and security in Europe by way of lowering the level of armed forces and conventional weapons, eliminating imbalances and the potential for a sudden attack, and for beginning large-scale offensive actions. All those who participated in the talks are obliged to make a contribution to realizing these aims.

The consultations will be renewed on 25 January 1988.

U.S. Tests Tracking, Control System for SDI

LD150801 Moscow TASS in English 0524 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 15 TASS—The United States has conducted the first test of a track and control system under the "Star Wars" programme using a ballistic missile. During the experiment held on November 3, ground-, air- and space-based sensors were tracking for 30 minutes the flight of an intercontinental ballistic missile from the moment of its launch from Vandenberg Base till its splash into the Pacific Ocean, specifying the parameters of its trajectory, the newspaper DEFENCE NEWS which is close to the Pentagon has reported. Concurrently, the installation was in operation to identify between real targets and decoys.

According to Sonny Dixon, director of the test programme, the track and control system operated satisfactorily. The Pentagon planned four similar tests for 1988, the DEFENCE NEWS reported.

U.S. Stance Toward Rarotonga Treaty 'Unchanged'

LD141552 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT
14 Dec 87

["Rarotonga Treaty—Commentary"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—TASS Correspondent Aleksandr Alekhin writes:

A year ago, on December 15, 1986, the Soviet Union was the first among the nuclear powers to sign Protocols 2 and 3 to the treaty on a nuclear-free zone in South Pacific (the Rarotonga Treaty). The Soviet Union pledged not to use nuclear weapons and not to threaten its use against the countries parties to the treaty and also not to test any nuclear devices in the treaty operation zone. Two months later, the USSR's example was followed by the People's Republic of China which became the second guarantor of the nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific.

Ignoring the wish by the peoples of that vast region of the world to rid themselves of the threat of a nuclear war, Western countries took a polarized position. Britain dodged the answer and France, which goes ahead with its nuclear testing at Atoll Mururoa, bluntly refused to join the treaty. The United States, too, has displayed a negative attitude to it. Vernon Walters, a permanent representative of the United States to the United Nations, touring the Asia-Pacific countries in April, said that Washington had other considerations regarding the future of that region. It is not hard to suppose that these considerations are linked, first and foremost, with the Pentagon plans to build up its military presence, nuclear one included, in the Pacific ocean.

A year that has passed since the signing by the Soviet Union of the protocols to the Rarotonga Treaty was marked by a momentous event—the agreement to eliminate intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles reached between the USSR and the United States. It would seem that this all-important step towards nuclear disarmament could lead to the United States' Administration amending its stand on other key issues as well. The United States' move to join the Rarotonga Treaty and sign the respective protocols guaranteeing the nuclear-free status to the south of the Pacific Ocean would become a manifestation of the new approach.

But as follows from Ronald Reagan's interview with a group of Asian and Australian journalists on December 9, Washington's negative attitude to the treaty remains unchanged. The President said that in the current circumstances the examination of the issue of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific would hardly lead to a change in the U.S. policy in that region. The President negated that this treaty was a contribution to the cause of peace.

However, the overriding objective to abolish nuclear weapons faced by mankind today calls for concrete actions. The establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific is certainly rated among them. Time itself demands that the other nuclear powers as well should become, along with the USSR and the People's Republic of China, the guarantors of the nuclear-free zone in that region.

Leningrad Citizens Cited on Disarmament
LD141416 Moscow TASS in English 1124 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Leningrad December 14 TASS—TASS correspondent Mikhail Abelev writes:

Like all residents of the USSR from the Baltic to the Pacific, the Leningraders followed closely the painstaking work in Washington. For it was clear that in importance they were unmatched in post-war international affairs. For the first time following Winston Churchill's notorious speech in Fulton in 1946, which launched the "cold" war right after the "hot" war, we have got more peace on earth, not much more but it was felt by all.

The results of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States and his talks with Ronald Reagan will be analyzed by politicians, diplomats, military men and eventually historians for yet a long time. But it is clear even now that the dimension of the results goes beyond the signed treaty on eliminating two classes of missiles. People have realized that nuclear madness can be treated only by common sense.

Leningraders have special scores with war. The blockade will always be a notch in the soul of even those who were born by far later. The past war left a sore point in the destiny of each Leningrader, which is passed from one generation to another. So, the problem of war and peace is uppermost to each family in Leningrad. Hence, such a concurrence of views among people concerning what has been achieved. "But it is essential that this should be followed by other steps, that military arsenals continue shrinking and the number of museums growing", Academician Boris Piotrovskiy, director of the Hermitage Museum, told me. "The Hermitage has over two million exhibits. Certainly, it is a large number but missiles and other weapons on each still outnumber them. This is absurd. It is not humanlike. It should be vice versa".

Professor Vladimir Almazov, director of the Cardiology Institute who heads the Leningrad organisation of the Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War Movement, said: "Mankind seems to be coming to the realization that making weapons more sophisticated does not at all mean either progress in thought or mature reason. I do not harbour the illusions that East-West rivalry will be halted in the foreseeable future. But it is our duty to get it to become peaceful. My dream is to see with my own eyes that mankind began viewing itself as something integral".

Over three days, we have heard several Russian proverbs in American parlance. One recalls one more old wisdom of ours: "Mischief comes by the pound and goes away by the ounce". Mankind has developed the grave disease of the fear of war long ago. And the cure will not come soon. But all, both we and they want to be cured. The moment when welcoming Mikhail Gorbachev at the White House Ronald Reagan said how Americans in an expectation of the visit were sending to him keys to their homes is unforgettable. The U.S. President's visit to the United States [as received] is ahead. If the new meeting will lower still more the threshold of armaments, I am ready to send my key to Reagan.

Honecker Gives Speech at Warsaw Pact Dinner
PM141347 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87
Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Dinner at State Council"]

[Excerpt] Berlin, 11 Dec—E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, today gave a dinner at the State Council building in honor of the participants in the meeting of the Warsaw Pact states' leading figures.

E. Honecker addressed those present. He said:

Dear Comrades!

Our meeting today is taking place right after an event of truly historic significance for further international development, for peace and the peoples' well-being. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has briefed us on the progress and the results of his meetings with President R. Reagan. I wish once again to thank you cordially on behalf of the Warsaw Pact states' leading representatives present here for this and, above all, for the successful work which you, Dear Comrade Gorbachev, have done over the past months and, particularly, during the recent days, also having our mandate.

We fully support the results of your peace mission. We see this as a great opportunity to embark for a long time on the path which leads away from the arms race toward disarmament and detente, toward a healthier international situation. These results accord with the expectations and hopes of all peace-loving forces, as convincingly reflected at the meeting of representatives of parties and movements held in Moscow at the beginning of November this year.

The Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles is a historic stage on the path to a nuclear-free world and the first practical conclusion from the thesis that mankind must be saved from nuclear catastrophe. The first treaty on disarmament to be concluded in the nuclear age and also the other measures outlined for the long term have been perceived throughout the world with great approval, with relief, and, not least, with hope. And this is understandable, since the path to stability and security goes not by way of more and more new arms but by way of sensible political decisions. This treaty is a victory which the world needs so much, it is not a victory achieved with the help of weapons but a victory over arms, a victory for reason and realism.

The progress made in Washington on the chief question of the disarmament process—concerning a significant reduction in strategic offensive arms while observing the ABM Treaty—is directed to the future. A constructive basis has been created for resolving important questions of security. This also applies to nuclear and chemical weapon tests, which must very quickly be banned everywhere.

In accordance with the logic of things, with the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles disarmament in the sphere of conventional arms is being advanced to the forefront of European security. Therefore the greatest interest is aroused by the submissions of the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact states, expounded by Comrade Gorbachev in Washington, on a necessary reduction in conventional armed forces and conventional arms in Europe.

Dear Comrades!

Part of what appeared just a possibility after the Reykjavik summit meeting is now becoming reality. This is of still greater significance in view of the fact that there is quite a lot that is contradictory and dangerous in the world and that even now there is no shortage of attempts to once again halt the transition from confrontation to detente. For how else can one explain the fears of some people that the disarmament process might go too far and the calls by influential forces for disarmament to be compensated for by arms in other spheres.

However, the European and other peoples expect the vigorous continuation of efforts to eliminate all stocks of nuclear weapons and the start of disarmament also in the sphere of conventional arms. The actions of peace-loving forces throughout the world attest to this. This demand has repeatedly been advanced from the UN rostrum and is a part of the nonaligned states' desire for disarmament and development. It was supported in the six states' well-known initiative.

Peace and disarmament—this is our credo. Here, in Berlin, 6 months ago our allied socialist states expressed their will that a world free from nuclear weapons become a reality and that not a single kind of arms be overlooked in the disarmament process, and all this under conditions of comprehensive verification and monitoring. We wish to continue following this path, and we will adhere unswervingly to this goal. This is indicated, above all, by the results of our conference, which give a new boost to our commonality and to our single desire for lasting peace.

Dear Comrades!

You are to leave Berlin today. I wish you all successes in your work for the good of our peoples, for the good of socialism, and in the name of ensuring peace.

Our meeting has strengthened our conviction that a nuclear-free world and purposeful disarmament are possible. We, the Warsaw Pact states, will do everything to implement in all its details the first treaty on a reduction in nuclear arms.

I propose a toast to lasting peace and disarmament, to our friendship and cooperation. To your personal well-being.

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a speech in reply. [passage omitted]

Pyadyshev Addresses Press Conference 15 Dec

Discusses INF Treaty

LD153151 Moscow TASS in English 1342 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—"Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the U.S. and the signing of the Soviet-American treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles have created a new world reality", Boris Pyadyshev, spokesman for the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at a briefing here today. "Of course, it is not an easy thing to give up nuclear missiles. Some people believe that they are a symbol of a country's might, of its power over circumstances. Some people maintain that by giving up nuclear missiles a country loses the accessories of a great power. This is an entirely wrong assumption. It is the ability of a country to ensure reliable stability of peace and prosperity both for its own people and for the world community in general which is an indicator of a genuine might of the great power".

"Some people maintain that the treaty was concluded on the basis of the U.S. 'Zero Option'. It is true that several years ago the 'Zero Option' was spoken about in the West. However, Western politicians never believed that this idea could be put into practice. In September 1983 Manfred Woerner, FRG defense minister who will soon take over as NATO secretary general, said: 'I shall crawl on my knees from my polling station to Bonn if intermediate-range nuclear weapons are removed from Europe'. Woerner would now have to crawl as much as 400 km. To make the task easier for him, the Greens Party sent him a present—soft knee pads.

"Franz-Fosef Strauss is facing a no easier problem. He also laid a bet that he would walk with a candle in his hand from Munich to Altotting. So, it is time for them to get going".

Describes Poll on Summit

LD151357 Moscow TASS in English 1330 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Nineteen percent of Muscovites think the results of the Soviet-American summit last week are very good, 54 percent regard them as good and 26 percent as satisfactory, according to the results of a public opinion poll by telephone taken by the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate among the inhabitants of the capital.

A total of 500 people were covered by the survey, Ministry Spokesman Boris Pyadyshev told a briefing here today.

A total of 64 percent of the respondents take the view that the Soviet side showed more political flexibility and a greater desire for agreement and this contributed to the success of the summit, while two percent believe those

qualities were more pronounced on the U.S. side. Twenty-five percent are of the opinion that the desire for accord was equally characteristic of both sides.

A total of 82 percent of those polled think the success of the talks was facilitated to a degree by the democratization and perestroika [restructuring] under way in this country.

Asked about the possibility of the summit having an impact in terms of quickening the process of settling regional conflicts, 51 percent of the respondents answered in the affirmative, 14 percent in the negative and 35 percent were undecided.

Talks With UN's Cordovez

LD151424 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1342 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, 15 Dec (TASS)—Today Yuliy Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, had a meeting with Diego Cordovez, UN under secretary general, who is in Moscow, said Boris Pyadyshev, a USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman at a briefing today. Today, too, Cordovez will be received by Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, he reported.

The USSR Foreign Ministry spokesman noted that there was a discussion of how to put into practical effect the proposals by Afghan leader Najibullah regarding the 12-month period for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan. Questions of the forthcoming round of Afghan-Pakistani talks to be held in Geneva under the aegis of the UN under secretary general are also being discussed. In our opinion, this round (which could possibly begin in February of next year, although we are not averse to it starting earlier), should be the last one.

Four documents on an Afghan settlement are practically ready, and only the timetable of withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan is lacking, Boris Pyadyshev stressed. There are clear, constructive, and realistic proposals for the timetable, and we hope this document too will be drafted shortly.

Vorontsov, UN's Cordovez Discuss Afghanistan

LD151234 Moscow World Service in English
1200 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Excerpt] In the Soviet capital, First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov has conferred with Diego Cordovez, UN under secretary general. The two men discussed the ways to reach as soon as possible a political solution to the situation in and around Afghanistan, and the prospects of concluding Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva, held through the mediation of Diego Cordovez. The Soviet Union believes that a coalition government involving different forces should be formed in Afghanistan. [passage omitted]

NATO Reappraising Relations After INF Treaty
LD132130 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1500 GMT 13 Dec 87

[Kipras Mazheyko video report from NATO Headquarters; from the "International Panorama" program, presented by IZVESTIYA Political Observer Vitaliy Kobysch]

[Excerpts] [Kobysch] In the past week a NATO Council session took place in Brussels. Here is a report from Kipras Mazheyko:

[Mazheyko] [Passage omitted] The Weinberger-Rogers tandem was always the first to become established and it dictated the pace on the route of each Atlantic marathon. That is indeed the custom here. Mostly we happened to see them in room No 16 a few minutes prior to the meeting of the Military Planning Committee. This time, in the usual place set aside for the U.S. delegation, new people appeared. I think it is worthwhile to get somewhat more closely acquainted with them. Frank Carlucci, the present secretary of defense, and General John Glavin, who replaced Rogers as supreme commander, are no novices in the sphere of high politics: Both of them have behind them dozens of years of practical work in the higher echelons of Washington's military, intelligence, and diplomatic services.

The first of them is unanimously described by journalists as a person whom Reagan has been looking for a long time for this role. The second has an impressive service record: He commanded the southern flank of the U.S. Armed Forces in Latin America and in the region of the Caribbean basin. In a word—this duet is not stuck for experience. Times are changing, peoples are changing. Albeit slowly, a creaking reappraisal is also taking place in the Atlanticists' views on existing realities. These are the first impressions produced by the NATO council session which has just ended. The success of the Soviet-U.S. meeting could not but bring a marked influence to bear on the Atlanticists' gathering. [passage omitted]

In Brussels, 2 days after the INF Treaty signing in Washington, the signing took place of bilateral treaties between the United States and five countries—Britain, the FRG, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands—that directly touch on the problem of the elimination of Pershing and cruise missiles. These documents define the procedure of military inspections at bases where these first strike weapons are sited. Perhaps on a global scale 3%—the number of missiles being destroyed—does look insignificant, but Europe has its own way of counting things: Not in terms of bookkeeping, but in human terms. This 3% amounts to 2,000 weapons, each of which is comparable in yield with the Hiroshima bomb. The latest types of classic arms also approach this bomb as regards their killing power. Meanwhile, a response to the

specific program of disarmament in Europe, submitted by the Warsaw Pact member countries back in June of last year in Budapest, was not forthcoming from there this time.

PRAVDA Views NATO Backing for Missile Treaty
PM141627 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kharlanov dispatch: "NATO Ministerial Session Held"]

[Text] Brussels, 12 Dec—The winter session of the North Atlantic bloc's Council, held at NATO headquarters in Brussels, lasted just 1 day. The final communique notes that its attention was focused on the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missile weapons that was signed by the USSR and the United States in Washington. The participants in the session declared that they welcome the conclusion of the treaty and express hope that it will open the way for progress in the cause of arms control in other spheres. They called on the U.S. Senate to ratify the treaty as soon as possible, noting in the final communique that it "fully accords with the North Atlantic bloc's security needs."

That was also said during the signing of protocols on military inspections between the United States and the five NATO countries directly affected by the problem of Pershing and cruise missiles. Belgian Foreign Minister L. Tindemans, noting the historic importance of the Washington treaty, declared that West Europe awaits its swiftest ratification by the U.S. Senate. British Foreign Secretary G. Howe noted that the USSR-U.S. treaty is the first agreement in history providing for the elimination of entire classes of nuclear arms.

Talk in the corridors of the session indicated that the question of how NATO would respond in the military and political spheres after the provisions of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles came into effect was discussed during the debate that followed a report by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz on the course and contents of the Washington talks. NATO generals are now trying to force on the bloc's member countries new plans for arms modernization to "compensate" for the elimination of Pershing and cruise missiles. For example, they are talking about stationing nuclear-capable F-16 bombers at the base near the Belgian city of Florennes to replace cruise missiles. Plans are also being promoted to replace obsolete types of tactical nuclear weapons and transfer new missile-carrying U.S. submarines to the NATO zone.

Answering questions on this subject during a news conference, NATO Secretary General Lord Carrington attempted to justify NATO's new plans in the nuclear sphere by using the notorious argument about the Warsaw Treaty Organization's superiority in the conventional arms sphere. The final communique on the NATO

Council session reaffirms the North Atlantic bloc's commitment to the doctrine of "deterrence and flexible response using both conventional and nuclear means."

The NATO Council made a decision that Lord Carrington will be replaced as NATO secretary general in July 1988 by FRG Defense Minister Manfred Woerner.

Socialist International Hails INF Accord
LD131524 Moscow TASS in English 1421 GMT
13 Dec 87

[Text] London December 13 TASS—"On behalf of the socialist international we congratulate President Ronald Reagan of the United States and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles. We believe that this historic agreement will become an immense contribution to the cause of universal disarmament and will make the world safer", says a statement signed by Willy Brandt, president of the organization, and Kalevi Sorsa, vice-president, chairman of the Socialist International's consultative council on disarmament.

The statement which has been circulated here by the secretariat of the Socialist International emphasises that the INF Treaty for the first time in mankind's history envisages a real reduction in nuclear arsenals and strengthens the security of all peoples, particularly those of European countries.

"The INF Treaty also opens up an opportunity to achieve positive results in other fields of disarmament and, first of all, in issues concerning a reduction in strategic nuclear forces, a ban on chemical weapons and on nuclear tests, and lays groundwork for real progress in the cause of reducing conventional arms. The Socialist International will render every kind of support for the attainment of these goals", points out the statement of the leaders of the Socialist International.

USSR Peace Committee Secretary on Developments
LD081857 Moscow TASS in English 1702 GMT
8 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—It has been decided to set up a public group named "Conversion" under the Soviet Peace Committee. Yevgeniy Oskalski, responsible secretary of the committee, said in a TASS interview that the group would rally authors of original designs of the readjustment of military hardware for peaceful purposes.

"We are besieged by enthusiasts working at plants and design offices, self-taught production rationalizers and inventors. They suggest that warplanes, helicopters, tanks of obsolete design intended to be used for scrap and missiles that are going to be phased out be used in

the national economy. The Soviet Peace Committee will invite highly skilled experts in this sphere, select the most promising designs and promote their realization", Oskalski said.

He pointed out that entirely new forms of public activities had emerged this year in the Soviet peace movement. "They have a number of things in common, specifically, their creative and informal character, the attempt to link concrete interests of participants in the movement with the general tasks of the peace struggle, as well as the desire to make those tasks concrete and support them with truly creative work", Oskalski said.

The setting up under the Soviet Peace Committee of the "Ecology and Peace" association met with broad response both in the USSR and abroad. It (?will offer) assistance to environmental protection agencies and separate people who work for the saving of life on earth from the menace of a nuclear catastrophe and from an ecological crisis. The "Peace in the Seas" commission rallied specialists and, in general, people who are interested in the problems of the world ocean which is the common property of humankind.

According to Oskalski, the "Communication and Mutual Understanding in a Nuclear Age" research group has set itself the task of revealing and removing obstacles on the way of a new political thinking in the sphere of psychology, language and political culture. The purpose of the "Education in the Spirit of Peace" public group is the activation of the human factor as a means of preventing a nuclear war. The "Rock Musicians for Peace" association started its activities in the USSR and abroad last summer.

Soviets, Hungarians Demand Civil Rights
AU111326 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German
11 Dec 87 p 2

[Unattributed Moscow Budapest report: "Programs With Demands in Moscow and Budapest"]

[Text] Moscow/Budapest—In a 12 point declaration thirty-one Soviet civil right activists have demanded, among other things, that "equal rights be granted to both, believers and atheists" as well as the "unconditional release and rehabilitation of all political prisoners." The declaration was adopted at a seminar of the Leningrad group of the "International Society for Human Rights."

Several groups in Hungary that are critical of the regime have published an eight-point program for the "unrestricted assertion of human rights". This year alone, there have been 15 cases of house searches, confiscations, and harassment involving independent publications, and of fines against dissidents, it was stated. Freedom of belief and of assembly also only exist on paper, it was pointed out.

OPEC Meeting Unable To Agree on Quotas, Prices
*LD141849 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT
14 Dec 87*

[Text] Vienna December 14 TASS—AT the meetings of the 82nd conference of the Organization of Petroleum-Exporting Countries (OPEC) after five days of difficult negotiations representatives of the 13 OPEC member countries have so far been unable to reach agreement about the quotas of oil extraction and prices of oil in 1988.

Kuwait's representative told reporters here that all OPEC member-countries except for Iraq support the draft compromise agreement which envisages establishing the quotas of petroleum extraction at the level of 15 million barrels of oil a day in the course of six months and pegging of the price of oil in the world market at at 18 dollars per barrel. An unexpected obstacle to the conclusion of the agreement which was planned to be adopted yesterday was the departure of the Iranian representative to Tehran to hold urgent consultations with the government.

According to the information from the sources close to the conference, meetings will be put off till February if the participants in the conference fail to reach agreement.

PRAVDA Review of Weeks International Events
*PM141015 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Second Edition p 4*

[Boris Averchenko "International Review"]

[Text] Only slightly more than half a month separates us from the always exciting New Year celebrations. Yet another year which will leave a notable trace in human history is receding into the past. It has been remarkable for many great events and actions. The biggest and most impressive was the celebration of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. It again showed clearly and convincingly that it is October, that it is socialism that are showing the world's peoples the way to the future, to lasting peace and progress.

At this time, on the threshold of the new year, people, when thinking about the future, are linking their dreams and hopes with the homeland of October, with real socialism, with the dynamization of its development and the strengthening of its positions in the worlds, with its unbending determination to protect terrestrial civilization from the threat of nuclear destruction.

There is something profoundly symbolic, something which inspires optimism and hope, in the fact that these pre-New Year days have been marked by an event of exceptional importance—a treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles has been signed at the Washington meeting of the USSR and U.S. leaders.

An important breakthrough has been made in the struggle for a nuclear-free world. The peoples have reacted with satisfaction to this event. They are expressing the hope that the opportunities opened up by the Washington meeting will be translated into even weightier real actions, and that the new year of 1988 will be a sunny and peaceful year open to creation and progress.

Breakthrough Into the Future [subhead]

The first step has been taken. It is difficult to exaggerate its significance. It is a step into the future, a practical step along the path toward a nuclear-free world and the implementation of man's sacred right to life. The annals of the peoples' history have been augmented by a new noteworthy date—8 December 1987—which marks a watershed separating the era of the growth of the nuclear threat from the era of the demilitarization of mankind's life.

It can be said without exaggeration that the entire planet warmly welcomes this historic event. Among us Soviet people it evokes particular pride and satisfaction, for 70 years ago the first act of the Soviet republic born in Russia was to proclaim the Decree on Peace. "...We promise the workers and peasants to do everything for peace, and we will do so," V.I. Lenin said soon after the victory of Great October. The CPSU unswervingly follows this behest of Lenin's.

During the period since the 27th CPSU Congress, which adopted a detailed plan for Soviet foreign policy activity, our party and state have done a gigantic amount of work in the foreign policy field aimed at implementing the strategic program for saving mankind from the nuclear threat hanging over it. This active and purposeful activity has led to important results and achievements, the main one that the Soviet people and the working people of the fraternal socialist countries have been ensured the possibility of living and working beneath peaceful skies.

Our party's appeal to strive for the assertion of new forms of political thinking and political awareness and actions matching present-day realities, panhuman interests, and humanitarian values attracted tremendous attention. It is no accident that today many prominent state and political figures, international observers, and academics are assessing the signing of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles as a triumph for common sense and the new political thinking.

Yes, reason has triumphed. Although this is still not the ultimate victory, it will be of major significance in both political and psychological terms. An important barrier in international development has been overcome, a point has been reached to which the sides had to travel a long and difficult path. It lay through Geneva and Reykjavik. Time and patience, fortitude and flexibility,

and persistence and strength of will were needed to clear away the obstacles that accumulated on this path over many years and to overcome deep-rooted stereotypes of thinking.

We recall how the leaders of the two powers did not manage to find solutions to the most important questions linked with curbing the arms race at their November 1985 meeting in Geneva. They stated that neither the USSR nor the United States seek nuclear superiority, and that a nuclear war can have no winner and must never be unleashed. A year later, at the next meeting in Reykjavik, not a single document was signed, but a fundamental breakthrough in interpreting the process of nuclear disarmament was made there. This opened up the possibility of the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles and also for a detailed examination of other problems relating to nuclear confrontation.

A start on real disarmament has been made in Washington. None of the agreements reached hitherto led to the destruction of weapons but merely limited the arms race by setting ceilings for individual types of weapon. Yet now 826 Soviet and 689 American medium-range missiles—deployed and nondeployed—will be scrapped. As is known, Soviet medium-range missiles are stationed only on our soil, while the Americans have them on the territory of their NATO allies—the FRG, Britain, Italy, Belgium, and the Netherlands. They all have to be destroyed. At the same time a start will be made on destroying 926 deployed and nondeployed shorter-range missiles on the Soviet side and 170 such missiles on the American side. This also applies to our shorter-range missiles stationed in the GDR and the CSSR. In addition to the missiles, their nuclear warheads, including the 72 American warheads earmarked for West German Pershing-1A missiles are subject to elimination. Appropriate measures ensuring effective verification of compliance with the provisions of the treaty for the entire duration of the elimination of the medium-range missiles (that is, 3 years), shorter-range missiles (1 and 1/2 years), and during the 10 years after that have been defined.

The understandings that have been reached and the experience accumulated by joint efforts in this difficult matter makes it possible to hope that ways will be found to unravel even more difficult questions of equal and universal security.

This week the attention of the entire world has been focused on CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Washington, his talks with U.S. President R. Reagan, and meetings with the American public. Many political observers and state figures have called this visit historic. They consider that the signing of the treaty and the deepening dialogue between the leaders of the USSR and the United States on other problems will give an impetus to the building of Soviet-American relations and bring fresh positive winds of change to the international atmosphere. Fundamental

significance is attached to the fact that an agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States to halve the two sides' strategic offensive arms while strictly complying with the ABM treaty was worked out at the Washington talks. Questions of conventional arms, chemical weapons, and many other problems have begun to loom larger. There were serious differences between the sides on a number of the points examined, of course, and there still are. The way to gradually overcome them is via even more active dialogue.

The results of the Washington meeting are being assessed highly in most states. They have received full approval and support from our closest friends and allies—in the socialist community countries. The participants in the 11 December Berlin meeting of Warsaw Pact state leaders expressed profound gratitude to M.S. Gorbachev for the Soviet Union's consistent and vigorous efforts which have led to the first real results in the cause of nuclear disarmament. It was stressed with satisfaction that this is an expression of the common peace-loving course of the Warsaw Pact states and of the socialist countries' initiatives and actions.

Commenting on the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles and their removal from the European continent, observers in the mass media are particularly noting Europe's role in world politics. Now, when the world is emerging at a new turning point in connection with real disarmament and the strengthening of trends toward cooperation, the role of Europe is not only irreplaceable but must grow. No major problems can be resolved without Europe. M.S. Gorbachev reemphasized this in the course of his conversation with M. Thatcher during his stopover in Britain on his way to Washington. Press attention has also been attracted by the proposal voiced by the CPSU delegation at the recent forum of French Communists on the usefulness of continuing dialogue among representatives of public and political movements, parties, and organizations and, for example, holding a "European round table" on security problems and advancing an all-European initiative in favor of peace and disarmament.

The path to the building of a nuclear-free world is not easy, but we believe in the feasibility of this great objective set by our party and will wage a persistent struggle to bring it closer. At the same time it would be a mistake not to also see that the most aggressive imperialist circles have no intention of scrapping their militarist armor. Although there is now enthusiastic talk in the West about peace, security, and cooperation, in practice the bosses of the military-industrial complex and zealous champions of force are pursuing a course aimed at accumulating and creating increasingly sophisticated weapons. They are striving to chill the thaw which has begun in the international atmosphere and to crank up the arms race even more strongly. This cannot fail to put you on your guard.

Along the Path of Renewal [subhead]

World socialism is a decisive factor of peace and social progress. Its development and strengthening are in the ascendant. Suffice it to say that the socialist states now account for over 40% of the world's industrial output, which is twice as much as 35 years ago. The output of socialist countries' industry is now equal to over three-fourths of the industrial output by developed capitalist states. The creation of a mighty economic and defense potential and the significant achievements in political and cultural building have transformed socialism into a powerful moral and material force of civilization on earth. Over one-third of mankind is following the path of socialism today.

At the same time, life presents the fraternal countries with new problems, demanding the fullest and most effective utilization of the accumulated potential and the decisive acceleration of scientific and technical progress. This is the only way the socialist community will be able to continue to successfully play its role as guarantor of peace and security for the peoples.

The congresses of the ruling Marxist-Leninist parties in the fraternal countries, held at the start of the 5-year plan period, defined the tasks of their economies' transition to intensive tracks of development and the active introduction of the achievements of science and technology in the national economy. During the first 2 years of the 5-year plan period the community states have done much work to improve the economic mechanism and the forms and methods of economic management, and to eliminate stagnation phenomena.

The restructuring being implemented in our country is a powerful catalyst of positive processes in the socialist countries. Our friends and comrades in arms in the common cause realize well that the course we have chosen promotes socialism as a whole, actively assists in deepening collaboration between the fraternal states, and gives new meaning to their cooperation in the political, economic, and other spheres.

The majority of fraternal countries have taken the path of renewal, restructuring, strengthening of socialism, and fuller revelation of its advantages. Of course, we are not forcing our "model of restructuring" on anyone. Each socialist country has its own singular specific features, potential, traditions, and approaches to the solution of tasks. Each one of them implements socioeconomic transformations and develops the democratization of society independently, using its own forms and methods.

At the same time, success for the community as a whole would be impossible without concern by each ruling party and fraternal country not only for its own but also for the common interest. The international principle of the community's members is based on close cooperation,

a respectful attitude toward each other's affairs and concerns, reciprocal learning, and the exchange of experience. All this makes it possible to accelerate our advance.

At present, the attention of working people in the fraternal countries is focused on the tasks of implementing the decisions of the 43d (Extraordinary) CEMA Session aimed at the restructuring and intensification of their foreign economic relations, built on consistent observance of the principles of mutual advantage and mutual assistance. Measures are being implemented to deepen the international division of labor, develop direct production cooperation ties, and create joint enterprises. The Comprehensive Program for CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress Through the Year 2000, which envisages a sharp boost in production efficiency, is being implemented. Numerous unsolved questions remain, involving the formation of a unified socialist market, price formation, foreign currency and finance, and other problems. Much persistent joint work still remains to be done on them.

By tradition, plenums of the ruling parties' Central Committees and sessions of the supreme organs of people's power are being held in the fraternal countries on the eve of the new year. They sum up the results of what has been done during this year and define the heights to be scaled in the upcoming 3d year of the 5-year plan period. It must be noted that, despite complex domestic conditions and the adverse economic situation in world markets, the CEMA states continued to build up output. New steps forward in their development have been taken by the GDR, Bulgaria, the CSSR, Poland, Romania, Mongolia, and other countries.

It is only natural that, when examining the year's provisional results, the fraternal countries not only note the achievements but also analyze the causes of omissions and shortcomings and seek out additional reserves. Particular importance is attached to questions of enhancing output quality and attaining modern standards in the development of machine building, power engineering, the electronics industry, and the introduction of the achievements of science and technology.

Soviet people and the peoples of the entire socialist world are engaged in creative labor and the renewal and improvement of their social system. They approach the new year with optimism and unshakable faith in the correctness of our common cause. This faith and optimism give them new creative energy in the struggle for a happy life, lasting peace, and progress.

'International Situation—Questions & Answers'
LD111851 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1030 GMT 11 Dec 87

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program presented by Igor Surguchev, foreign political commentator for All-Union Radio, with Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Commentator Boris Andrianov; Vladimir Pasko; Commentator Aleksandr Korshunov; Sergey Pravdin; and Vyacheslav Lavrentyev]

[Text] [Surguchev] I have asked Radomir Georgiyevich Bogdanov, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to share with us his impressions on the results of the third meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan. Radomir Georgiyevich, please go ahead:

[Bogdanov] Sometimes, the real significance of events of international life can be seen more clearly against the backdrop of what went on before. The path toward the agreement that has now been signed, to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles, was a lengthy one. Geneva and Reykjavik became the most important stages along this path.

Let us recall: In November 1985 the leaders of the two countries succeeded not only in resuming the summit level dialogue, broken off long before, but also in finding common points of departure for a fruitful development of this dialogue. At that time, the USSR and the United States achieved agreement that nuclear war must not be fought and cannot be won.

Reykjavik translated the ideas about a world rid of nuclear weapons into a language of specific accords. The seemingly insoluble questions—what is to be done with the nuclear arsenals, with what to commence their reductions, how to safeguard trust between the two countries—became the subject matter of difficult, but businesslike and honest examination.

We have now witnessed how accords become reality. The door leading to mankind's nuclear-free future was opened only a fraction in the capital of Iceland. Having signed the treaty, we have entered this future.

This means that Soviet-U.S. relations, the disarmament problems, and international relations as a whole will all acquire a new quality. The area of mutual understanding will become wider; the trust will become fuller; the basis of future agreements will become more reliable. It is important to continue to move in this direction, to attain a nuclear-free future, and not to linger for long at its threshold. The main thing is that agreements on radical reductions of strategic offensive weapons—with the ABM Treaty being preserved—on eliminating chemical weapons, and on reducing conventional arms should become reality as speedily as possible. As far as each of these problems is concerned, the USSR has made specific proposals. We are of the opinion that accords on them are within reach.

[Surguchev] Radomir Georgiyevich, please describe briefly the Soviet-U.S. treaty that has been signed. Specifically, what is it about?

[Bogdanov] You know, it is very difficult briefly to inform our radio listeners about the content of this document, which runs, in all, to more than 200 pages. It is a whole book or, by way of comparison, approximately

10 newspaper pages. All the same, I will tell you about the main thing—how much and what is being eliminated. Above all, medium-range missiles are being eliminated, that is to say those missiles with the operating range of 1,000-5,500 km, and shorter-range missiles, with a range of 500-1,000 km.

In the USSR, missiles known in the West as the SS-20, SS-4, SS-5, land-based cruise missiles, and shorter-range missiles—SS-12 and SS-23—fall within this scope; in the United States these missiles are Pershing-II, the land-based cruise missiles and the Pershing-1A missiles. Thus, all missiles with an operative range of between 500-5,500 km are being scrapped. The USSR in all will destroy approximately 2,000 missiles of both classes—both of the deployed variety and those in storage—while the United States will destroy approximately 850.

As far as nuclear warheads are concerned, we are scrapping approximately 2,500, while the United States is scrapping 1,320. And one more figure: 826 medium-range missiles are to be eliminated in the USSR and 689 in the United States. All medium-range missiles are to be eliminated within 3 years.

The treaty stands by a system of inspection and verification that has been worked out in depth [sistema inspektsii i kontrolya]—not just the verification of the elimination, but also by the inspections of suspect sites and inspections over production. The terms of reference of the inspections [proverka] are extraordinarily strict, the strictest in the whole history of arms control. To a significant extent they can in future be made applicable also to the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, the movement toward which represents the main content of the summit meeting.

Inspections will be carried out on the territories of the USSR and the United States and also on the territories of their allies where medium- and shorter-range missiles are situated. These are the GDR, the CSSR, Belgium, Great Britain, Holland, Italy, and the FRG; thus, the treaty encompasses nine countries.

All allies, ours and those of the United States alike, have agreed for the verification to be carried out.

I would like to recall that in Reykjavik Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said: Since we are entering a specific stage of eliminating nuclear arms, we should be completely clear about verification. Verification ought now to be made stricter, and the USSR is in favor of treble verification [troynoy kontrol].

[Surguchev] What effect will the treaty have on the development of the talks on reducing arms? What is the logical connection between it and subsequent steps in this direction?

[Bogdanov] It would surely be a mistake to judge the significance of the treaty and the prospects opened up by it proceeding solely from the number of warheads subject to destruction. This number is not so significant in relation to the nuclear arsenals that have been stockpiled—some 3-4%, but the state-of-the-art, highly precise missiles and warheads are being destroyed. This undoubtedly leads to a lessening of the intensity of the nuclear confrontation and of the mutual concern the sides have about the possibility of a sudden nuclear strike entailing the heaviest consequences.

The treaty represents the taking into account of the balance of interests—not the arithmetical balance of forces, but a more complex and more important balance of mutual interests. One should not become like those sceptics, who boil the treaty's essence down to numbers.

All the more reason not to allow the treaty's opponents—and they did and do exist—to devalue the political significance of the attainment of the accords. Not only did the treaty make possible what only yesterday seemed impossible—the real, physical destruction of nuclear arms. It also deals a blow to the concepts of a limited use of nuclear arms and the so-called controlled escalation of a nuclear conflict. It has opened up the path toward talks on a 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms. Finally, it makes it possible to attain success at the talks on reducing conventional arms.

Naturally, no one would argue that considerable difficulties remain. Only the first obstacle has been overcome along the lengthy path toward a nuclear-free, demilitarized world. However, after all, it is only those who are doing the walking that can conquer the road, and it is important that the first step—albeit small—has been taken so as to emerge from the impasse.

We give credit to the U.S. partners: jointly with them, experience has been accumulated which will help in the search for solutions to even more difficult questions of equal and universal security.

[Surguchev] Radomir Georgiyevich, the progress in the area of disarmament has undoubtedly influenced also the state of Soviet-U.S. political relations. What can you say on this?

[Bogdanov] Well, Comrade Gorbachev's visit undoubtedly reflects the improvement both of the general atmosphere in the world and, naturally, of Soviet-U.S. relations. More than that: itself it facilitated this improvement.

The key problem of international relations at present is the problem of ridding political thinking of the habit of staking one's hopes on force. You cannot enter the nuclear-free age with Stone Age thinking.

Over the past 10 years, relations between our countries were, as it were, at freezing point: Not a single agreement on arms reduction, extremely insignificant Soviet-U.S. trade, economic, scientific and technological cooperation. With all this, a dangerous military confrontation has been almost on the brink of the abyss, into which both our countries, along with all mankind into the bargain, could have been pushed. Such a situation can hardly be considered normal. That is why any movement away from the brink of the nuclear abyss, any normalization, and, I would say, Soviet-U.S. relations becoming civilized, is a movement in the correct direction.

If we had the will, political wisdom, and resolve to take the first step; if we have enough resolve and wisdom to continue to move along the path toward eliminating the existing tens of thousands of warheads, and chemical weapons, toward a major reduction of conventional armaments, we will yet witness, during the lifetime of the present generation, how the world begins to change in front of our eyes.

The accord that has taken place, the possible subsequent steps in the sphere of disarmament, can become the first issue which really belongs to all mankind and is worthy of man, an issue that would lead us to become aware of the internal integrality [tselostnost] and unity of our civilization.

Who knows, maybe the historians of the 21st century will count off the eras of human history by such events, belonging to the whole of mankind, and reflecting all that is best in living memory, such as the rout of fascism, the victory over smallpox, and the commencement of nuclear disarmament.

[Surguchev] We receive letters, containing questions about the USSR's relations with the PRC. Thus, for instance, Shcherbakov, an inhabitant of Moscow, who unfortunately, like some other letter writers, fails to give his name and patronymic, is interested in what other areas, apart from trade, we have contacts with China?

I have asked my colleague, commentator Boris Andrianov, to tell us about it:

[Andrianov] Just over 5 years ago, in October 1982, Soviet-Chinese political consultations began. They were conducted by special representatives of the two countries' governments. Initially, these consultations provided practically the sole channel for an exchange of views on the entire range of relations between the USSR and the PRC. I have recalled this in order that a clearer picture may emerge of what tangible and positive shifts have taken place over the past 5 years in Soviet-Chinese relations, moreover, essentially, in all spheres. However, judge for yourselves: Mutual visits of deputy heads of governments of the two countries have become regular since December 1984. Incidentally, they end with rather major accords that facilitate the development of mutually advantageous bilateral relations;

The resumption, following a break of more than 20 years, of contacts between legislative bodies of the two countries undoubtedly represents a significant event in the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. These contacts have already acquired a permanent nature;

The new treaty on consulates came into force this year. In accordance with it, general consulates of the USSR in Shanghai and of the PRC in Leningrad were opened. Business ties between our countries are becoming ever more vigorous. Sessions are held of the Soviet-Chinese Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technological Cooperation;

Border ties are being expanded and this is, moreover, the case not just in the area of trade. In particular, specialists from the two countries, working to compile a scheme for a comprehensive utilization of waterway and power resources of the Amur and Argun Rivers, have successfully carried out their field work.

Naturally, contacts in the spheres of science, culture, and sport, and ties between public organizations now represent an important part of Soviet-Chinese relations. Ties between art unions of the two countries have developed tangibly, as have exchanges of trade union delegations, delegations of social scientists and of specialists in the area of natural sciences, exchanges of students and lecturers, contacts between friendship societies, and in other spheres.

Our countries are currently working on a new, intergovernmental plan for cultural cooperation. Now it will be for a 3 year period: 1988-90.

Such plans, as is known, provide the framework for ties and contacts over a very broad range, from science to sport. It is an eloquent testimony to the growth of positive and mutual interest in various aspects of each other's life.

The fact that our mutual relations have developed to a certain extent in the political sphere, too, is also noteworthy. It is, perhaps, sufficient to note that meetings of the foreign ministers of the USSR and the PRC in New York, during UN General Assembly sessions, have become a regular occurrence. They take place in a constructive atmosphere of goodwill. This represents the confirmation of the obvious truth that Soviet-Chinese dialogue has over the past few years acquired a regular nature.

Political consultations continue. Eleven such meetings have already been held. During the meetings, the two sides confirm the sincere desire to improve and develop relations between the USSR and the PRC.

Things are moving step by step at the talks on the border issues. The talks resumed 10 months ago. A working group of Soviet and Chinese experts, which will occupy itself with a specific examination of practical questions

pertaining to the course of the border line along the entire route of its eastern part, will assemble in Moscow at the beginning of next year.

It should be noted that the Soviet leadership regards the border talks with China as very important. The talks occupy an important place in the whole complex of Soviet-Chinese relations. As far as we know, the Chinese leadership likewise adopts the same approach to these talks.

These coinciding positions are determined by the search for a mutually acceptable solution to the existing problems, including those handed down by history. The problem of a Soviet-Chinese border settlement also belongs amongst them.

All this, taken together, makes it possible to state that favorable preconditions are currently taking shape for cooperation between the USSR and the PRC in the political sphere too, which without any doubt will serve the vital interests of the peoples of the two countries.

[Surcuchev] Some of our listeners ask us to tell them about the nuclear potential of France and Britain. Comrade Telekhov from Leningrad and Pimenov from Cherepovets ask the question: When will these powers at long last take steps in the same directions as the USSR and the United States; that is to say, steps that have led the two countries to the historical accord providing for the elimination of two classes of nuclear arms in their countries.

My colleague, Aleksandr Korshunov, replies to the authors of these letters:

[Korshunov] Some figures, to begin with: The French and British strategic forces, according to what is an authoritative military publication in the West—MILITARY BALANCE—published in London by the Institute of Strategic Studies, represent a rather impressive potential. If you take them together they comprise 10 atomic submarines equipped with ballistic missiles; 18 strategic missiles situated in underground silos; and more than 100 aircraft capable of carrying nuclear bombs and missiles. According to many experts this number of aircraft is in reality higher, since tactical aviation aircraft are also capable of carrying nuclear arms.

The reality is this: On both sides of La Manche [the English Channel], a course has been taken to increase the level of arms and not just to modernize which, generally speaking, is a natural process for as long as armies exist as such. How do these major shifts—I would even call them tectonic—that have just taken place in the problem of arms control and reduction with the signing of the INF Treaty by our country and the United States tally with the absence of political will on the part of London and Paris toward reducing their own nuclear arsenals?

Officially, they have chosen the wait-and-see position, declaring that their nuclear arsenals are extremely insignificant in relation to the nuclear potential of the United States and the USSR, and for the time being, they do not take any specific steps toward disarmament.

However, as I have just said, the British and French nuclear forces are hardly all that small. Moreover, things are moving toward an intensified buildup of these forces.

This runs counter to the conclusions of authoritative scientists and military experts, shared by a majority of sober minded politicians, that Europe's vulnerability to the consequences of a nuclear conflict makes it impossible to ensure security with the aid of military force.

That is why the position taken by London and Paris alike runs counter, for the time being, both to common sense and to the aspirations of the peoples of the continent.

Gorbachev Speaks on Results of Summit
PM151225 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 87
Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "M.S. Gorbachev Speech on Soviet Television"]

[Text] Good evening Dear Comrades,

The visit to the United States has ended. The path toward it was not simple. There were Geneva and Reykjavik, there was an intensive dialogue between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States, there were intensive diplomatic talks. We have been continually cooperating with our allies and an active exchange of views with the leaders of other states has been held. We have been especially attentive in heeding the mood of the international public, scientific and cultural figures, and representatives of various political tendencies that support peace.

All this enriched our ideas about the processes underway in the world and gave us confidence that we are going in the right direction. Thus we set off for the visit to Washington, with the mandate of our people and our allies, and bearing in mind the mood and the expectations of the millions of people of goodwill in the whole world.

In setting out for the United States we carried out very detailed preparations. We weighed thoroughly, and discussed on more than one occasion in the Politburo, the principle position that we would present there and checked everything out again from the military-technical viewpoint. The decisions of the 27th congress of our party and the program of a nuclear-free world announced on 15 January 1986 represented the philosophical and political basis of this preparations.

The content and the results of the visit are well-known. The U.S. President and I signed the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. The agreement that was achieved on this issue is a major event in world politics; it is a victory of the new political thinking. The focal point of the intensive talks, which took up the majority of the time, were the questions concerning strategic offensive weapons.

We confirmed our readiness for a 50% cut in that type of weapon, on the condition that the ABM Treaty should be preserved in the form in which it was adopted in 1972. This is reflected in the joint declaration on the results of the meeting.

We again put forward the question as a matter of urgency of the necessity to conclude as soon as possible a treaty on ending nuclear tests. There was a thorough discussion of the question of the elimination of chemical arms and the cutting of conventional weapons and armed forces in Europe.

In general we sought to make sure that questions of disarmament, the removal of the nuclear threat, the weakening of tension and confrontation in the world, and the strengthening new approaches to the construction of international relations should be moved to the foreground. This is what did indeed happen during the talks.

The main result of the Washington visit is the signing of the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles. This is the first step in the real destruction of the nuclear arsenal. Even yesterday this seemed like utopia to many. Today it is becoming a fact. People say that only a modest step has been taken: Mankind will be ridding itself of only 4% of its nuclear arms. But it must not be forgotten that, according to the calculations of scientists, 5% are sufficient to destroy all life on earth. Nor is that all. The treaty showed everyone the possibility of turning away from the arms race toward disarmament.

Now the task is to maintain the atmosphere that made it possible to conclude the treaty and to go on acting constructively and consistently. For this it is necessary first of all to give the treaty the force of law, to ratify it. As far as the USSR Supreme Soviet is concerned, I hope it will support the agreement, for this is the will of our people. Of no little importance, too, is the fact that many deputies of the Supreme Soviet and a number of its commissions, primarily foreign commissions, took a practical part in examining questions connected with the drafting of the treaty.

We know that in the United States there is a struggle going on around ratification. But we also know—and again felt this acutely while we were in the United States—that the American people support this treaty.

This is now a very crucial time. I want to tell you that at the meeting in Berlin the Warsaw Pact leaders displayed a full understanding of the significance of this moment and of its nature as a turning point. In the adopted communique, unanimously approving the results of the visit, they resolutely stated that at the new stage, too, they would act in concert in the interests of disarmament and international cooperation. It can be said that in the majority of countries of the world, too, the reaction to the results of the Washington meeting was extremely positive.

But when a shattering of old views occurs, inevitably resistance grows on the part of those who link their political and material well-being with them. Only 3 days have passed since our return, but certain circles in the United States, and in other Western countries too, are already mobilizing in order to prevent a change for the better. Voices calling on the U.S. leadership not to go too far, to halt the disarmament process, are being heard more and more loudly. They are demanding that measures be urgently taken to make up for the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles by moving new

nuclear forces into Europe and toward Europe, and by modernization of the nuclear and other armaments still there. Some people are even trying to claim that the talks in Washington removed the differences on such a question as SDI, and on this pretext they are calling for this program to be stepped up.

I shall say straight out: These are dangerous trends and should not be underestimated. They can undermine the turnaround in the process of democratizing international relations that has taken shape. It is our view that the world community, primarily the people of the United States and the Soviet Union, and healthy forces in all countries, will double their efforts in order to safeguard the first shoot of nuclear disarmament that has pushed through the rock-hard layer of prejudices and stereotypes of hostility. It is now very important, as people say, for us all to work together to promote the deepening of positive trends and the strengthening of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The accords reached represent a historic opportunity for all mankind to begin to throw off the heavy burden of militarism and war, which have not only claimed monstrous human sacrifices, but also retarded economic development and material culture, and fettered freedom and the spiritual and social creativity of the peoples.

During the visit and during the discussion of all issues the question of the role and responsibility of the United States and the Soviet Union cropped up in one way or another, and of how they should work together. How they should build their relations, for this is important for Soviet-U.S. relations themselves and for the world as a whole. Understanding of this is growing not only in the Soviet Union, but also in the United States. We noticed this when meeting and talking with political and public figures and with scientists and cultural figures.

In our talks with the President and other U.S. politicians, we repeatedly stressed that we need to understand the new realities and to act accordingly in relations with each other, to coexist, to treat the choice of each people with respect. We said plainly that we had come to Washington not to engage in wrangling and mutual accusations—whereas the U.S. side very frequently resorts to this—we came with the aim of engaging in real politics. Of course I think it will be interesting for all of you, comrades, to learn what was the reaction, the conduct, of the U.S. Administration.

What are the United States' positions, and views on our relations? Are any changes occurring here? We in the delegation exchanged opinions more than once on this question, one which is not easy to comprehend. I must tell you that if one sticks firmly to the facts and does not slip into exaggeration, then it is too early at the moment to speak about a fundamental turning point in our relations. Too early yet.

Nevertheless, I would like to point out that the dialogue with the President and other U.S. political figures was different and more constructive than in the past. From the contacts we had with representatives of intellectual and business circles and of the mass media, I also got the impression that changes are occurring. But our attention was particularly drawn by how the wave of amicability on the part of ordinary Americans has grown along with the way that they, through television and the press, learned what we came with, what our views really are, what we want, and how indeed Soviet people regard the United States and the American people.

I told the President that the Soviet leadership is ready to turn our mutual relations into a channel of mutual understanding and constructive cooperation in the interests of our countries and the whole world. It is precisely in this context that we asked other questions, too, inviting the U.S. Administration to a joint search to unravel the more acute questions of present-day international politics.

We persistently raised before our counterparts the question of the opportunities facing our two countries to render assistance in a political solution to regional conflicts.

Although we did not move very far forward on this, the discussion on these questions did bring greater clarity and makes it possible to count on a continuation of the dialogue.

In the joint Soviet-U.S. statement at summit level a large place has been given, as you will have noticed, to the development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the United States. Concrete accords were reached on a number of questions in the sphere of scientific cooperation, cultural exchanges, and contacts between people. Both during the talks, and in particular at the meeting with representatives of business circles, there was an interested discussion on the questions of expanding economic cooperation and trade.

Positive changes in this sphere would be of great importance for the improvement of the whole atmosphere of Soviet-U.S. relations and, indeed, for the situation in the world. But for this, as I have had occasion to say before, huge efforts are needed from both sides, first and foremost from the U.S., by whose fault many artificial barriers have amassed on the path to normal, mutually advantageous economic ties.

Dear Comrades, I should like to tell you about something else, too. My visit to the United States showed very clearly the attention with which the whole world is following our restructuring. They ask countless questions of the most varied kinds. What is restructuring? Is there any resistance? How resolutely are we, the Soviet people, in favor of restructuring? Won't we stop halfway? Are our people accepting such a profound renewal of society? This is a genuine, unfeigned, sincere interest in what is

happening in Soviet society on the paths of restructuring. It shows a recognition of the role of our country in the modern world. For us, it is yet another reminder of the fact that the more successful we are in carrying through the revolutionary matter of restructuring, the more successful things will be in the international arena too.

Such is the real situation at present. Such is the dialectic of world development. It is yet more evidence of how the present-day world is mutually interdependent and how it represents a single entity, all of its variety and contradictoriness notwithstanding. We ought to understand this well, and we ought to bear it in mind as we tackle concrete, practical tasks in any town, any village, every labor collective, and in the country as a whole, too.

Let me express words of gratitude to all Soviet people for the growing contribution to restructuring, for responding by action to the party's call for a revolutionary renewal of society, for the active participation in the transformations which have begun, for the support of the efforts of the Central Committee and the government in the struggle for the cause of peace to become firmly established.

Without all this there would have been no success at the talks that have taken place; they themselves would hardly have been possible. Thank you comrades. Let us congratulate ourselves on the success; we will continue to work. All the best to you.

Gorbachev Predeparture News Conference Reported
PM151331 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87
Second Edition pp 3, 4

["Press Conference by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee"—headline]

[Text] Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, held a news conference 10 December for journalists covering the summit meeting in Washington. M.S. Gorbachev's Speech [subhead]

Esteemed Ladies and Gentlemen.

Comrades.

We can now regard the visit as having been completed. Today the delegation leaves for home. We will have a brief stopover in Berlin. We have agreed with the leaders of the Warsaw Treaty countries to meet in order to discuss the results of my visit to Washington and the negotiations that I've had with President Reagan and other political leaders of the United States of America.

I realize, and it is natural, that you are interested, first of all, in our opinion, our assessment, of the results of this visit. I feel that you want to hear more about those results. So perhaps in my introductory remarks I will use up more time than usual.

First of all, I'd like to say that this has been my third summit meeting in the last two and a half years. This in itself, probably, says a great deal, and firstly about the dynamism of the political dialogue between the U.S. Administration and the leadership of the Soviet Union.

Therefore we can say that Geneva and Reykjavik were not in vain, as were not in vain other steps taken by our side as well as by the U.S. Administration.

But had the third meeting not led to certain results, it would not have given us occasion to place this visit in the category of important events.

I should like to begin my assessment of this visit first and foremost by saying that it has become a major event in world politics. I would even go so far as to say that we might even talk about beginning a new phase, and a very important phase from the standpoint of Soviet-U.S. bilateral relations, and from the standpoint of the world situation.

Much has taken place during the negotiations. But I should like to find some very precise words so that I should not go to the one or the other extreme, but to convey the character, atmosphere, and of course to characterize the political results of the visit and the talks.

What are, then, the results? What can we tell you about them today?

First, we can talk about a deepening political dialogue between the leaders of the United States of America and of the Soviet Union. Today the President and I have issued a joint Soviet-U.S. statement at the highest level. This fact alone bears witness to a certain dynamism in our political dialogue.

The importance of that document lies in the fact that it shows both the range and the content of the discussions that we had. In reading this document you will be able to gauge both the degree of mutual understanding and accord on various questions. You will also feel, I trust, that this document at the same time is confirmation of the fact that serious discord still remains.

What do we assess on the positive side in that document?

First, the President and I have noted that, in relations between the U.S. and the USSR, certain progress has, of late, been achieved.

Second, once again, having glanced over our shoulders at the events of the last few years we have agreed that what has been achieved today is based on Geneva and Reykjavik. It is those events that made possible the steps aimed at improving strategic stability and lessening the danger of conflicts.

We have, and I want to draw your attention to this, forcefully affirmed the solemn declaration of Geneva. We deemed it necessary to do this once again at this meeting in Washington. We affirmed that nuclear war should never be fought and cannot be won, that we are fully determined to prevent any war between our countries, nuclear or conventional, and that we shall not seek to achieve military superiority.

This is something that we regard as an undertaking of unlimited duration by the two great nations before the entire world community.

Third, emphasis has been put on the special responsibility devolving on the Soviet Union and the United States for the quest for realistic ways of preventing military confrontation and building a safer world for mankind entering the third millennium.

Fourth, while realistically assessing the fact that differences still exist, and on some points those differences are very serious indeed, we do not regard them as being insurmountable. On the contrary, they urge us on toward even more active dialogue.

Summing up this **conceptual portion** of our joint statement, I could say that at the highest level of our two states, it has been recognized that they are now emerging from the long drawn-out confrontation, that they are prepared to leave it behind us.

You will agree that this is an important political result and an important political statement which is contained in the joint document. It is in this that the essence consists of a transition to a new phase in Soviet-U.S. relations.

Second, in the course of the visit, **work has been completed, and it took us many years, on preparing a treaty to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles** on a global basis. As you know, the President and I signed the agreement to that effect.

I have already had occasion to speak about the significance of this first step on the road leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. But now that this has been done, when signatures have been affixed to that document, signatures on behalf of the peoples of our two nations, we can speak about a major event, a history-making event, I would say. We can speak of the great success achieved through joint constructive effort.

That is probably the importance of this document. The percentages don't really matter. What does matter is that we have opened up a new phase in the real process of nuclear disarmament by agreeing to eliminate two classes of missiles.

I would say that this is our common success, the success of our two countries. But at the same time, it is a success for our allies who took part throughout this long marathon at all stages of the quest for compromise, the quest for new approaches and the process of resolving these difficult problems. I would here like also to make a reference to all the participants in the public and social movements, whose actions stimulated the politicians in our countries and political circles throughout the world, and urged us on toward finding solutions and concluding a treaty eliminating nuclear armaments, particularly this class, and not stopping, despite difficulties and obstacles.

And they did exist, these difficulties and obstacles, they were very real, they were not invented. Many of these problems were new and unique, especially insofar as verification is concerned.

Generally speaking, this treaty is the net result of the joint efforts of all the nations. So we can sincerely congratulate each other on having taken the first step on the path toward a nuclear-free world. That is our common victory.

Third. **At the center of attention of the negotiations these past few days was the problem of a real and radical reduction in strategic offensive arms.** That problem took up most of our time. Some of the questions relating to this part of our discussions were resolved at the time when the participants in the official farewell ceremony were already waiting for us on the South Lawn of the White House. I think you will understand this, because reduction in strategic armaments is, after all, the centerpiece of Soviet-U.S. relations. It is a question which is of great concern to all of the world's community. You journalists are well aware how closely the world has followed and is following the process of negotiations on this very question.

We were talking about a reduction in offensive strategic arms by one half. It is a complex issue. Both sides came to the conclusion that on this road, too, we must make a serious breakthrough, resting on the experience that we accumulated over the preceding phase in the negotiations. Including the experience gained in preparing the INF Treaty. This should be done without delay, while there is a real opportunity at hand to arrest the arms race, to arrest the buildup of strategic potentials, and address the cause of eliminating them.

Now, what is the scope of the agreement on these issues we're talking about? Right after we met with the President and exchanged views on this issue, and right at the outset, it was this topic that became central to our discussions. The President and I issued instructions that a group of experts should be set up with participants from both sides. It was headed on our side by Marshall Akhromeyev, the chief of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces. On the U.S. side it was headed by Ambassador Nitze.

All of these three days the group worked day and night. The group was given the task of preparing an agreed draft of instructions for the Soviet and U.S. delegations in Geneva, which on its basis are to elaborate a treaty on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms with compliance with the ABM Treaty and nonwithdrawal from it over an agreed period of time, in such a way that this treaty could be signed during the visit of the U.S. President to Moscow in the first half of 1988.

As a result, we achieved **considerable headway**—and I use these words after considering and weighing everything—on this problem, which is the major one for the Soviet Union, the United States, and all states.

As you know, even before the meeting in Washington, agreement had been reached to reduce the strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the USA by 50%, setting out a limit for strategic vehicles of 1,600 with 6,000 warheads. Previously agreed upon had been sublevels on heavy missiles on the rules of counting heavy bombers, etc.

Following the work done here in Washington, quite a lot was added that was entirely new.

At long last, we developed the problem of limiting the deployment of long-range, sea-launched nuclear cruise missiles. The U.S. side has agreed to establish limits for such missiles over and above the 6,000 warheads and to conduct a search for mutually acceptable and effective methods of verification of such limitations.

On this score, we had a pretty interesting exchange of views. We took advantage of the achievements of our science and technology in the field of creation of national means capable of verifying the presence of nuclear weapons on various naval ships, whether surface or submarines, without any actual inspection on the vessels themselves.

I don't know whether they believed us, but we suggested that if we reached agreement we could share our achievements: Let our partners see for themselves that these means offer the opportunity to determine by national means not only the presence but the yield of charges. This problem, the problem of verification, had been the most difficult obstacle to resolving the entire problem of sea-launched cruise missiles.

Incidentally, about the achievements in science and technology. I said to the President that it was very important to involve our scientists in these problems because they can really give expert assessments and realistic recommendations. I suggested that we should set up a Soviet-U.S. committee of scientists who could put forward their views and recommendations to the U.S. Administration and the leadership of the Soviet Union.

But let us return to the results of the negotiations. There has been detailed elaboration of the question of verification. Earlier they had presented a lot of difficulty. Mutual understanding in this field is a consequence of the successful work done in preparing the INF Treaty.

Limits have been set. **Forty nine hundred warheads** for the aggregate quantity of warheads for ICBM's and SLBM's within the aggregate level of **6,000 warheads**. As you see, that is a new point, and it is a substantial one.

The President and I, with due regard for preparing the treaty on strategic offensive arms, have instructed the delegations in Geneva to elaborate an agreement which would make it incumbent upon both the Soviet and the U.S. sides to comply with the ABM Treaty in the form in which it was signed in 1972. That includes the process of research, development, and if necessary, tests, which are allowed under the ABM Treaty, and that for an agreed upon period of time there should be no withdrawal from the treaty. That is what we inscribed in our joint statement. We agreed that we would continue intensive discussion of the questions of strategic stability.

It has also been defined that, if the USSR and the United States fail to agree by the expiry of the agreed date of nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty, then each side will have the right to determine its mode of action.

As you see, we have moved significantly ahead on the **problem of nuclear and space arms, which is the most important and the most complex one**. But for us to be able within several months to prepare the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive arms, there is a great deal of work ahead for our delegations in Geneva, and not just for the delegations, but also for the leadership of the Soviet Union and of the United States.

Fourth. After having really reached the position of destroying medium- and shorter-range missiles and addressed the problems of reducing strategic offensive arms, questions of **conventional arms and chemical weapons** have loomed larger.

One could say they have become very acute and have come to the fore. We are not inclined to dramatize the situation; we condemn any attempts to speculate on that. This I would like to emphasize so that that remark of mine should sink in. Perhaps, you ought to give thought to it.

There are some very real concerns over the questions of conventional arms. Both we and the Western Europeans have those concerns. Therefore, we're inclined right now to pay most serious attention to these types of arms. Now we have good experience which we have accumulated in preparing the INF Treaty. Those present here may recall

the ups and downs that we had to go through in preparing the treaty. You can recall the question of the nuclear potential of France and Britain, the question concerning operational-tactical missiles, recall the missiles deployed in Asia, and so on.

Nonetheless, readiness to meet each other halfway has brought us to a conclusion of the treaty.

From here stems a simple conclusion. That is also the way we should act in questions pertaining to conventional arms. To address serious questions, to remove really existing concerns. The West asserts, for example, that the Warsaw Treaty countries have a superiority, but the East says that the NATO and West Europeans have the edge over it.

I must say that both sides are right, in a way, because they're basing themselves on really existing data. These facts confirm one thing—that there is indeed asymmetry and imbalance which have taken shape as a result of the historical specific features in the building of armed forces.

We believe it is necessary to begin by elaborating agreement on a mandate for the conference presently underway in Vienna.

We must sit down at the negotiating table, and look for solutions to the problems at hand. Negotiations can be meaningful only if we can talk about a mutual and simultaneous reduction and elimination of imbalances and asymmetries. With that approach, we could surely resolve all the issues.

Some declare, for instance, that the Warsaw Treaty states have the advantage in central Europe, but those who speak of this, for some reason, gloss over in silence the fact that NATO has a considerable superiority on the southern flank of Europe, next to the borders of the Soviet Union.

We believe it necessary to discuss, as well, such questions as the formation of a corridor between NATO and the Warsaw Pact with limited armaments—first and foremost of an offensive nature.

We should also ponder the principle of sufficiency, and in general compare military doctrines in a thorough and businesslike way from the standpoint of transforming them into purely defensive ones.

I must note that the U.S. side treated our proposal seriously and in a businesslike way and displayed interest, and we have agreed to address this problem directly, in a concrete way, at the level of our military establishments and with the participation of scholars and experts.

In short, as for conventional arms and armed forces, I suggested to the President here in Washington that we give a new political impetus such as the one that was

given in Reykjavik on the problems of nuclear disarmament when we saw that the Geneva negotiations on them had practically reached a deadlock. This yielded benefit then, and now we have the first treaty on elimination of nuclear arms.

Today, we can take the same approach to the problem of conventional arms. We believe that is exactly how we should act. We should sit down at the negotiating table. We should lay our cards on the table. We should cast aside all altercation. That will surely show who is trying to be too sly. [redacted] is in earnest, because both Americans and [redacted] Europeans, and we, and our allies, we all [redacted] not only how much there is installed and [redacted] here. I believe it is a good thing that both [redacted] and we know it. Knowledge is a [redacted]

We should lay [redacted] change all of the relevant data, [redacted] asymmetry in armaments and [redacted] upon the search for solutions. This is our approach.

In so far as we are concerned, let me say outright, that we are prepared to take up ourselves to that task without delay, and we shall insist on that being done. That is the opinion of our allies too. So I am expressing our common view on this regard.

Moreover, we are prepared for most drastic reductions.

Here too, we are trying to be realists. Probably this is a process which will have to go through certain phases. You can't resolve everything outright. But we have to start by sitting down at the negotiating table and get down to an elimination of asymmetry and imbalance to drastically lessen the confrontation. That would be a significant achievement, and that could be done in the near future.

In other words, we must be attentive and businesslike in treating the concerns of either side over questions of conventional arms.

At the talks with the President we also talked about chemical weapons in the same spirit. The importance that they be eliminated is obvious. This question has long since been under discussion and its discussion has recently built up some momentum, thanks to constructive interaction of the sides.

I deemed it necessary in my discussion with Mrs. Thatcher, and also here, in my talks with the U.S. President, to note the contribution made by the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany and other West European countries to the solution of this problem. Let me say that this stimulated us as well. The Soviet Union acted in a constructive way, especially in questions of verification and elimination of the stockpiles of chemical weapons. Let me remind you once more that we have ceased production of chemical weapons.

There was also a positive statement emanating from the United States. But of late it has been found that the process of movement toward elaboration of the convention has clearly slowed down. This is something we said directly to the President and the other participants in the negotiations on the U.S. side. We believe that the process slowed down through the fault of the United States. We felt that the U.S. side would like to deviate from the objective of general and complete prohibition of chemical weapons agreed at Geneva and exclude binary types of these weapons from the ban. The United States would like to leave aside binary types of chemical weapons. The United States would like in the event of signing that convention, even with such "blank spaces," to limit facilities for verification only to state-owned ones. What does that mean? For the Soviet Union it means all of them, and for America and Western Europeans—almost nothing. So, what kind of equitable approach is that? What kind of consideration for concerns? What kind of partnership is it?

The U.S. Administration, all of West Europeans, all the participants in the negotiations should understand that the Soviet Union does not want any unilateral advantages and is prepared to advance in all directions in the process of disarmament, in such a way that balance and parity are maintained at every stage.

We will insist that it should be so. But if someone is uncertain and believes that he is being outpaced, it will undermine the process of disarmament, inject nervousness, uncertainty, and complicate the atmosphere of the negotiations.

The attention of the U.S. side was drawn to this and we proposed that those imbalances be rectified, and that this viewpoint be registered in our joint statement. Although our talks on chemical weapons proceeded with difficulty, at long last we did manage to agree that the two sides would conduct more intensive talks on elaborating a convention.

The President and I expressed our dedication to the solution of this extremely important question, and we have instructed our experts to continue active discussion of the question of the non-use and on the non-spreading of chemical weapons as well.

Now about one other problem, which has always been extremely important, but which now, after the signing of the INF Treaty and in connection with the progress that we have charted on reducing strategic offensive arms, is now becoming still more topical. That is the problem of halting nuclear tests. You know that we have begun negotiations with the United States on that question. We posed before the President the question that in the changed situation it would be extremely desirable, and this would be correctly understood and properly appreciated in our countries and throughout the world, if we, in these changed circumstances, took a fresh look at this process as well, at these negotiations, at the content.

We said it was desirable in the nearest future to reach agreement on lessening the yield of the nuclear explosions and resolutely reduce the number of nuclear tests, but that is the minimal step which should be taken as quickly as possible so that we could move further ahead without any delay.

At the same time, in the present, now taking into account and respecting the demands of the world public, we consider it right and possible to establish a mutual moratorium on nuclear tests while the talks are underway. Unfortunately, so far we did not meet with understanding on the part of our partners in this very important question which is causing the concern throughout the world.

Now, if we've started to disarm, this means we must consider any question in that context, and think and act accordingly. That is why we are not losing hope that our very important invitation to the U.S. Administration to introduce a mutual moratorium on nuclear tests while the talks are in progress will still be given serious thought, that it will be carefully weighed. Perhaps the administration might wish to consult with the people. We are told that America is a democratic country. So why not to consult with the people on this issue and, perhaps, positively respond to our proposal. We are not losing hope.

Now, what else would I like to say on the military aspects of the negotiations? I would like to point out that a major extremely important breakthrough has been made in the question of verification. I would say that the INF Treaty establishes unprecedented standards of openness, of glasnost. The scope and depth of mutual monitoring and verification [proverka i kontrol] are without precedent. The position which we have frequently expressed has been confirmed by action: Where verification [kontrol] of disarmament is concerned we will be the most vehement advocates of the most rigorous and effective verification [kontrol]. But if there is only talk about verification [kontrol] while the arms race goes on under cover of such talk, then what is the sense in such verification [kontrol]? In short, we are in favour of any kind, of verification [kontrol], the most rigorous verification [kontrol], if that is verification [kontrol] of disarmament, the elimination of armaments and when the principle of reciprocity is observed and implemented. This is all the more important today when we are approaching the solution of problems connected with strategic offensive arms, when we have approached the problems of eliminating chemical weapons.

Besides, we already have experience and we feel more confident. We exchanged views with the President on a whole spectrum of other questions as well: regional, humanitarian. The examination of regional problems was not easy. We came here with serious intentions, with proposals to really reach agreement on the most acute questions. We drew attention to the need to consider our

joint approach to the solution of regional conflicts proceeding from the following: We are now witnessing an unquestionable striving of the world community to solve the existing regional conflicts by political means. This is clearly seen in the attitudes of many political quarters and governments, in actions of the world public. This phenomenon is present.

This offers the USSR and the United States—the two countries upon which much depends—the chance to really do something in resolving these very acute problems of world politics.

I can't say that we have made much headway in here. Yet, I and the members of our delegation have the feeling that the U.S. Administration has started approaching regional problems somewhat more realistically.

Indeed, new approaches are needed here. Most important, both we and the Americans and other countries should unconditionally recognize that all nations have the right to their own choice. That is the crucial point of departure.

Regional solutions cannot be divorced from the question of human rights, and humanitarian issues. What can be higher than the right to security, to life, to settling one's national affairs as one sees fit? What can be more favorable for democratic forms and processes than a country's reliable security?

In short, all this is interlinked, and it is from these positions that we approach the situation in Afghanistan. We are for a settlement which would make it possible to put an end to the internal bloody conflict, to prevent the possibility of its recurrence, to prevent the origination in the process of political settlement of such a situation that would have serious consequences for the interests of the world community.

We said outright that we do not want, we do not strive for a pro-Soviet regime in Afghanistan. But the U.S. side must just as clearly state that it is not striving for a pro-U.S. regime there. In a free, non-aligned, neutral Afghanistan, there must be set up a government on the basis of reconciliation, on the basis of taking into account the total of political realities, cooperation, on the basis of a coalition of various forces and their national reconciliation. Here our two countries can do a lot.

On Afghanistan, we put the question as follows: The political decision on the withdrawal of troops has been taken. We've named the time limit—12 months. It can be less. That is the fourth item that is awaiting its solution under the aegis of the Cordovez Commission. Our position is that the beginning of the withdrawal of troops must at the same time become the beginning of the termination of assistance with arms and money to the dushmans. From the very first day this is declared, our troops will start withdrawing. They will not take part

in military operations, except in self-defence. Hostilities cease and a process of political settlement begins. We shall assist it in the measure of our influence. But the main effort should be by the real forces within Afghanistan itself, all of the sides concerned.

It seems that all this can produce a genuine document facilitating the process of political settlement. We have agreed to continue our work in this direction.

We discussed at the talks in Washington also regional conflicts in Central America, the Middle East, southern Africa, the situation in the Persian Gulf, and so forth.

On bilateral Soviet-U.S. relations. The Soviet position was the following: The USSR and the United States are world powers, possessing major economic, intellectual, and military potentials. Their weight in international affairs is immense. That determines their role, and that determines their responsibility.

The many years of confrontation and sharp rivalry have produced nothing but harm. We have already proved sufficiently that we can live without one another, without trading, without having any extensive scientific or cultural contacts, without any cooperation in the solution of global issues. But the question arises: Is this what we have to prove? Does this not recall the useless labors of Sisyphus? Is it really that two great nations, two world powers should not ponder the situation which has come into being as a result of the acute confrontation throughout almost all the post-war years? The time has come to think all this over, so I said to the President and his colleagues, does it not seem to you that politicians are lagging behind the moods of the peoples? We judge by the sentiments in our own country, and we judge by the sentiments of the American people, and feel they want changes for the better. They are beginning to act on their own. They are establishing contacts, searching for various forms and means of these contacts, and displaying amazing ingenuity in the process from the children to the wisest people in our countries. Everybody understands that the time has come to turn the last page of confrontation and begin a new stage. These are very powerful imperatives, I believe, and they should be reflected in the policies of our governments.

I assure you that the Soviet leadership has no two opinions. A firm decision has been made about which I am speaking today—we are in favor of a decisive improvement in relations with the United States of America. Our peoples need it, the entire world needs it.

I reminded the President that the world was already watching with laughter and mockery the way in which our two countries build their relations. A lot of different things have been said about this, for instance that we approach any problem head-on, with our visors down. Here we really are on the wrong path and we can go much too far unless we stop.

I feel that all that happened at the talks and all that was publicly said by me, the President and other political leaders these days, confirms that except for some narrow groups there are no opponents of precisely such an approach and such an awareness.

If these responsible political declarations are followed by responsible and real steps, then we can look forward to better times, to better years. I believe that not only our peoples, but the whole world will applaud this.

Also this last week, on the eve of my visit to Washington I had some meetings with foreign statesmen—Kaunda, a well-known political figure of Africa, and Australia's Prime Minister Hawke. They were very insistent in advising me, in asking me to tell the U.S. President that both in the West and in all continents people are hoping for an improvement in international relations.

In these discussions with them I told them why not make their own contribution. But they kept saying that they are ready to make their contribution, but the main thing was for the USSR and the USA to come to terms with each other.

I feel that we must realize all this and embody it in real politics. The time has come.

I assure you that we will act, proceeding from such an understanding of the situation.

In the very first meeting we had, I said this to the President, at meetings with leaders of the Congress, with representatives of the intellectual circles of America. I said this in my meeting with the U.S. media executives and representatives of the business community. I said this publicly in all my speeches.

I hope that our voice will be heard. It has been heard, I think, by the American people. I can see how even the reaction of people in the streets becomes different.

All of a sudden Americans appear in Washington's streets. They are in good spirits. They wave their hands. At one point on our way today I was driving with the vice president and we got out of the car and we came up to a group of Americans. I could feel their sentiments. I said to them: We are talking about how to draw closer to each other, how to improve our cooperation. Urge on your President toward this, the Soviet people are solidly urging us. So I have not just been engaged in politics, but in propaganda. (Animation in the hall). Although I consider that the best propaganda is real progressive constructive policy.

In our bilateral questions, as soon as we began to think about how to come closer to each other, a great many problems immediately came up for discussion which we could address ourselves to, and you will see it in the joint statement. There are many questions of climate, of preserving the ozone layer, peaceful space, a flight to

Mars, medicine, the thermonuclear reactor, trade, etc. This opens up possibilities for us to address ourselves to some specific serious joint projects.

So these days were filled with serious discussions, exchanges of views. I believe that the content of this visit offers me an opportunity to say that it was a significant dialogue and the results too are significant. I believe all this will bear fruit if we consistently move step by step ahead, however difficult it might be, and I'm sure that it will be difficult. But we will move ahead in the quest for mutual and acceptable solutions and with due regard for each other's interests. A great impetus has been given to that process.

In conclusion, I deem it my duty once again sincerely to say a few words about the feelings expressed by the Americans on the eve of the visit and during the visit. Just before the news conference I met a group of American young people and I told them that both American and Soviet kids seem to come to terms together much faster than we politicians. They have no complexes. Before we can come to terms, we have to get rid of old stereotypes, of the obstacles standing in the way. That's not all that easy at a ripe age. But they, the youngsters, they look at each other openly and they find a common tongue very quickly. It is not a superficial, children's or a rose-colored approach. They are serious people. At the age of between fifteen and seventeen, they are already giving very serious thought, not only to their personal problems, not only to what is of interest to their own selves. They're thinking about the world, about how we should live in this world. It's a remarkable phenomenon. It should be written about.

In my discussion with the media executives, I explained why I give interviews so rarely although I am an enthusiast of lively exchanges. Three, four, five interviews showed that the same questions are being asked. Then what are we going to talk about? Just to beat the air? To try and prove that we have not 4,000, not 2,000, not 500, but only 22 individuals who are imprisoned in our country for having infringed the law, that there are only 220 persons who have been refused permission to leave because they dealt with defense and computer technology, control systems, in short, with state secrets. No matter what you say, no matter what you write, no matter who shouts at us and from where, we will not let them go before these secrets become obsolete. Such is the world today, and we are forced to take this into account. Yet, everything in our relations is being reduced to this and interviews are being requested not to find out the truth, not to prompt each other to thought, but simply to expose a politician as quickly as possible, to drive him into a corner. Is that a dialogue? Is that the purpose of interviews and generally is that what the media is for? People want to live better, people want to have a better understanding of each other, they want to communicate with each other, to be friends. How much is being inflamed through the press. This is done supposedly because of a desire for more openness. I'm not trying to

accuse you, I'm not saying that politicians are such wonderful people, or that such bad people are working in the media. No, I'm simply saying that the media too needs perestroika, and should master the new thinking. Do you agree with this? (Animation in the hall).

Let us think together, because we're all in the same boat. Or is everything clear to you? If that is so, I envy you. But at the same time, if everything is already clear to you, I pity you. Please give thought to this.

Availing myself of this opportunity, I want to return to the thought about the reaction of Americans, the feelings they have expressed these days. I would like, right now, as this visit is drawing to a close to say thank you for their hospitality, for their openheartedness, for their cordiality. They can be sure, that this will be heard in the Soviet Union, by the Soviet people, and it will meet with a sincere, lively, and human response. I want them to hear these words.

Upon my return home, we will describe our impressions of our visit to this country.

The visit was restricted to Washington. I would like to come to the U.S. again when the situation permits and communicate with people. That is my sincere desire.

I would like to wish the American people good achievements in their land and fine achievements and hopes. I wish to assure Americans that, on the part of the Soviet people, they have a reliable partner in all that concerns peace, cooperation and common progress for all.

Thank you. (Applause).

M.S. Gorbachev answered questions put by correspondents.

Question: In your book "Perestroika" and in your speeches, you've talked about a process of democratization in the Soviet Union. Now that you've had at least a fleeting encounter with the American concept of democracy, I wonder if you could tell us what you've learned and what differences you see between American ideas of democracy and your own ideas of democratization?

Answer: I have felt that there is a need, both in your country and in ours, to try and understand what values underlie American society and what values underlie ours.

This problem was a subject of serious dialogue and discussion both with the President—in face-to-face meetings—and in meetings attended by other parties, including a meeting with congressional leaders.

We have agreed: Let us take all these issues—concerning democracy, concerning human rights, everything that lies in the humanitarian sphere—out of the plane of political speculations and bring them into the plane of

realistic study and familiarization with the values that have been formed by the American people in following the road of their choice, and the accomplishments of the Soviet people since making their choice in 1917.

We agreed that this should be done at the level of the Supreme Soviet and U.S. Congress by organizing discussions, seminars and meetings and thorough conversations and assessments. We are prepared to present and characterize our situation and set forth our view of the situation in America, as we see it. The U.S. side should say in a solid, substantive way what it believes must be said. This implies taking up this matter in a serious way. I think we will find that to be beneficial.

Question: Probably one of the most abnormal conditions in the relations between the U.S. and the Soviet Union is the level of trade. Can you tell us in this summit meeting were you able to discuss this problem with President Reagan, or with other leaders on your visit here? Could you give us your thoughts on the potential for economic cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union?

Answer: This is a very interesting question related to a big subject. I think that if we have made an earnest choice in favor of changing our relations for the better, we cannot allow weakening in dynamics in any direction. So far, little has been done in fact to expand economic cooperation and trade.

One cannot hope that it is possible to conduct with success a political dialogue without restructuring economic ties, economic relations. I had discussions over the past three days with the President and with the leaders of Congress—which made its "unique contribution" (laughter) by adopting so many amendments that it will now require a huge bulldozer to remove them all.

I asked them to review this situation. Today, I had a substantive conversation with businessmen, with major representatives of America's business community. One can say that there is understanding of the need for change for the better in this important sphere. The final document contains a record on this account. It is directed at stimulating trade, economic relations and implementation of major projects, including the establishment of joint ventures.

I think that this political message enables U.S. business and business circles in the Soviet Union to step up cooperation. The possibilities for that are enormous, as those who know the Soviet Union assess them.

An American representative said today that in contrast to ties with China he had noticed that the Soviet Union has enormous purchasing power and that there is therefore an enormous incentive to set up joint ventures. But that is no competition. Both we and you maintain ties

with China, and we will welcome if you continue developing them further. I think that our relations with the People's Republic of China, with our neighbor, with our friends will be developing.

Question: On several occasions during the past week outside the Soviet Foreign Ministry, your authorities dispersed non-violent, peaceful demonstrators. Is that perestroika, is that glasnost?

Answer: Where laws are violated those who are duty-bound to confirm that the state exists, the laws exist, enter the scene. Sometimes incidents occur but only then when the law is violated. In this particular case everything passed normally, as it should be in accordance with law, and the incident was exhausted.

Question: There had been some hints from some of your colleagues before you arrived here that there could be some progress on offensive weapons without an obligatory insistence on the ABM Treaty, that there could be some compromise on strategic defense. However, the impression now is that you are still making that link. We're told by administration officials that you reasserted that linkage during the talks. Do you see any way that between now and a visit to Moscow by the President, that there could be a treaty on strategic offensive armaments without first reaching agreement on an ABM Treaty, or is that linkage permanent?

Answer: Our position was outlined in my opening remarks. We will work hard to make the President's visit to the Soviet Union culminate in the signing of that treaty. We shall be acting constructively on the basis of the principles which were agreed upon and published in the joint statement.

Question: You recently proposed a reduction of the military forces in the north, in particular naval forces. Somehow later this proposal was not mentioned although it is part of NATO-Warsaw Pact relations. Is this proposal still alive? What is the fate of this proposal? Will it be included in the further exchanges between East and West?

Answer: In conditions when we have embarked on the road of nuclear disarmament and intend to tackle conventional armaments it is important to avoid a situation when while solving one set of questions we would pile up even bigger problems in other spheres. That is, as we start removing nuclear arms from Europe and Asia on a global scale—I refer to the class of medium- and shorter-range missiles—there should not be any sudden "compensations" with the purpose of intensifying the military confrontation in other regions.

I think that would be wrong and that is why our proposal to scale down military activity in northern areas is constructive and proceeds from the general idea of lessening military confrontation. It remains in force.

Question: Diego Cordovez, the United Nations mediator on Afghanistan you mentioned, has proposed to begin a new series of negotiations in January or February to help create a political settlement—an interim government in Afghanistan that would include the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, the seven mujahidin factions, or as you call them dushmans, and a group of Afghan elders, perhaps led by the former king. Do you support those efforts to create an interim government in Afghanistan, and if such an effort were to succeed before summer of next year and the United States were willing to end its arms supplies to the mujahidin factions, would you begin the troop withdrawals at that time, that is next summer, from Afghanistan?

Answer: I believe I have outlined our approach in detail. But since the question has been asked I will say that we would welcome it if there is a new meeting in January-February. We, for our part, are prepared to facilitate this. I believe that if these two questions are interlinked, the rest already are, the question of the withdrawal of troops and the question of terminating assistance with arms and finance, then we could reach a positive result already in the coming month. We have agreed with the President to continue consultations and to study in greater detail the positions of the sides on this matter.

Question: Which is the most productive and promising field of political dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States in the immediate future?

Answer: Let's not indulge in guesswork. Yet, I believe that we have created some assets now during this meeting. If we are consistent in our actions, if we display restraint, we can bring about serious changes in various areas, first and foremost disarmament.

Question: How much did your views and the U.S. views meet or differ on the issue of the Persian Gulf? Particularly that you'd been charged of jockeying for position and shielding Iran. Why is the Middle East international conference no longer such a priority for you?

Answer: Let me start with your second question. I asked the President to give thought again to the attitude of the U.S. Administration to the preparation and holding of an international conference on the Middle East because, as it seems to me, there is broad agreement in the world about the expediency and possibility of holding it.

It appeared to me that the discussion of this subject will be continued because the preparation of the conference should not give rise to the concern of the U.S. Administration. Within the framework of this process there can be bilateral, trilateral and regional meetings. So it appears to me that such a format of the conference makes it possible to take into account the diversity of views expressed on this score by many governments. I think progress is possible here.

As for your first question, yes, we have been accused of wanting to look good and purportedly of acting in such a way as to make the Americans look bad. I disagree. But a side gives this or that impression depending on the way it acts and not on how its actions are characterized by somebody. You have the possibility to observe how we act and how the Americans and the others act, and develop an opinion of your own.

We hold that a big responsibility rests on the great powers, on the permanent members of the Security Council to prevent the origination in that region of a situation that would bring about a major conflagration. At all stages, already before the adoption of Resolution 598 and today, we say that it is necessary to act in such a way that the parties to the conflict would feel what is expected of them and that they should be given a possibility to realize the impermissibility of aggravating the situation. We also feel that we have not yet exhausted that resolution, its possibilities.

I will limit myself to this remark because we had a more concrete discussion but have not completed it, and have decided to continue it so as to fulfill the responsible role of the two countries at this very complex stage of the development of the situation in the Persian Gulf and in the Iran-Iraq conflict.

Question: If two or three years ago someone had tried to forecast the events of these past days, that would have perhaps been described as political fantasy. Now it is becoming reality. I would like to ask you what is the objective basis for that. What is the objective basis underlying the current process, the current turn? Why is this turn happening now?

Answer: When we made our statement of January 15 and set forth our plan for a phase-by-phase elimination of nuclear arms and the easing of military confrontation in all spheres many people used to say that it was an illusion. Now life itself has put such forecasters to shame.

When we arrived in Reykjavik, the place of a most dramatic meeting—incidentally, who of you present here were in Reykjavik? (a lot of hands are lifted). Good...

You will recall the atmosphere in which my news conference began. The expectations failed and everything ended so dramatically. I saw journalists in the hall and their mood was transmitted to me. I saw that I was facing not simply professional journalists, sharp-tongued media people. I saw people concerned at what was going on. That mood was catching.

I remember that news conference. Today I can confirm by 100% what I said there—Reykjavik is a dramatic event, but at the same time it is an important breakthrough in coming to realize that, in the end, there is something that governs and determines actions and behavior of politicians. There occurred a dramatic change

in the sentiments of world public opinion in recent years—a change leading people to realize the inevitability of many troubles that would affect all humanity.

This happened thanks to the activity of the intellectuals in all countries. They came to realize what was happening—physicists and mathematicians, medics, people in the arts. Their apprehension and alarm was transmitted to all strata of the population. Without momentous changes in the minds of people in all countries we would have hardly seen the variations that have made it possible to take the first major step in the sphere of real disarmament—the signing of this major history-making document.

Question: We know you are planning a trip to Latin America soon. What is the purpose of that trip and what political initiatives can Latin Americans expect from the Soviet Union in the near future?

Answer: You already know that I'm going there very soon? (animated response in the hall) I have a desire to go to some countries of that continent where very serious, deep changes of historic scope are taking place. I believe that the way things will be developing on that continent, if you add to that what is going on in Asia, will largely determine the course of world politics. This is why dynamic and momentous changes in Latin American countries, in my opinion, prompt any politician who wants to know the reality, to go there so as to have his own observations and come up with his own analysis that could be used in the political activity. So that's the main motive. I think that Latin America has big prospects before it in terms of embarking on a broad path of development. But the difficulties facing it are also big.

Question: Do you think that you were able to change President Reagan's ideas about the Soviet Union in your meetings with him? Six or seven years ago he used to say that the Soviet Union was an "evil empire".

And the second part of the question. Have you changed any of your ideas about the United States based on these 3 days in Washington?

Answer: Well, I guess that the President's views have changed for the better, as have mine.

Question: It is pleasant to hear that you are flying to Berlin tonight. How do you assess the contribution made by the Warsaw Pact allies, the contribution made by the GDR, to the treaty that you have signed?

Answer: Not a single constructive move made over the past few years was made without the participation of the allies. Everything was considered and discussed together. In all things we were acting in perfect harmony—on a permanent basis, and this is why I want to say once again that we are grateful to and appreciative of our allies for

making a major contribution to the preparation for this meeting, to this treaty on the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles. Well, the rest I will say in Berlin.

Question: It appears that both you and President Reagan are of the opinion that in this 3-day summit you have significantly altered the course of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It would appear that in the 3 days of summitry, that somehow the relationship between you, one to the other, was altered. What specifically has changed?

Answer: I think that the agreements we have achieved in the past 3 days will be of paramount importance for the development of relations between our countries. On one condition: That we will remain loyal to our commitments. I would like to assure the American people and the administration that we shall act in a responsible manner, proceeding from our agreements. I think we now have more understanding between the President and myself. Our dialogue has become more businesslike and approaches have become more constructive, and I'll even venture to say that we trust each other more.

Question: In today's remarks at the departure ceremony at the White House, neither you nor the President mentioned the forthcoming visit by Ronald Reagan to the Soviet Union. Will that visit take place, or does it depend on further progress in your relations?

Answer: Definitely so. The joint statement says that.

Question: Would you tell us to what extent can the success of perestroika depend on the achievement of agreements in the field of disarmament?

Answer: The notion of relationship between disarmament and development applies to perestroika as well.

Question: After signing the INF Treaty, what is, in your view, the significance of establishing a nuclear-free corridor in central Europe?

Answer: This subject is acquiring greater urgency now. I would call it a valuable initiative.

Question: Did you discuss during the talks in Washington a definite time limit for nonwithdrawal from the ABM Treaty and the so-called interpretation of the treaty? Was anything said by the Soviet or the U.S. side on the SDI program?

Answer: I would answer like this: Everything was discussed.

Question: You said that the Soviet Union was also working in the field of strategic defense...

Gorbachev: I did not say that.

Question continued: After your meetings with Ronald Reagan, what will you instruct your experts to do in this field? Will they speed up their work or slow it down?

Answer: I said that we were conducting basic research which, in some directions, covers problems that are designated in America as defense initiative. I did say that. But I also said that we are strong opponents of SDI. We will not develop it at home. We call on the U.S. Administration to do likewise.

But if the U.S. Administration does not heed our opinion, if it embarks on creating SDI, it will assume all responsibility.

Strategic stability will be disrupted. New spheres of the arms race with unpredictable consequences will emerge. If the Americans have much money, let them squander it on SDI. We will look for a response along other, asymmetrical lines, that will be less expensive by a hundred times, or probably more. This is what I said.

Question: In your recent address in Moscow, you said that the world and you could not accept a summit from which nothing came except the signing of agreements already reached. Now, all that has happened, from what you tell us, is that the INF Treaty was signed. You were turned down on the disarmament corridor, you found no agreement on the test ban, and I'm wondering if you are at all disappointed, and if you think maybe we should be?

Answer: I don't want to repeat my introductory remarks in which I gave a detailed assessment of the outcome of the visit. I have nothing to add.

Question: Are the two sides any closer on the question of how long you would both agree to comply with the ABM Treaty? Do I understand correctly that without such an agreement the Soviet Union would not go ahead with any deal on strategic missiles?

Answer: We issued instructions to our delegations, and they will continue talks in Geneva. At the moment, I don't want to go into specifics of those problems.

Question: You've always said that the most important thing is to stop the extension of the arms race into outer space. Has your meeting here this week made that any less likely?

Answer: I don't think so. I confirm now that preventing the transfer of the arms race into outer space remains the goal of our policy.

Reagan Lauds INF Treaty, Continues SDI
*LD141839 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1754 GMT 14 Dec 87*

[Text] Washington 14 Dec (TASS)—Concluding the Treaty on the Elimination of United States and Soviet Medium- and Shorter- Range Missiles was an "historic achievement," said U.S. President Ronald Reagan today.

Speaking in the capital, in the Center for Strategic and International Studies, he stressed that last week's signing of this important agreement was "the culmination of the process to build a safer world." The head of the U.S. Administration stressed on more than one occasion, that the INF Treaty enjoys broad support from America's NATO allies. At the same time he acknowledged that in the United States there are "some who are concerned about this agreement." The President tried to dispel these fears, which are not concealed by representatives of right-wing circles in the United States. Reagan described this agreement as a "new step in the relations between East and West."

The head of the White House stated that at the Washington Soviet-U.S. summit meeting progress was also achieved in discussion of the issue of reducing strategic offensive weapons by 50%. However, he again stressed the intention of his administration to continue with work to create a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements. The United States, he said, "will move ahead with the SDI program. And we shall deploy it when the system is ready," stated Reagan.

Reagan, Shultz Confident of Ratification
*PM141559 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87
Second Edition p 6*

[TASS reports under general heading "New Opportunities"]

[Text] Washington, 13 Dec—In his Saturday radio address to the nation, President Reagan said that the signing of the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range missiles has replaced arms control with arms reduction for the first time in history. The next step after the signing of the treaty, the President said, will be its submission to the Senate for ratification.

Reagan announced that on Friday morning he had met with congressional leaders to discuss this question. "And I am confident that the Senate will now act swiftly to discharge its duty in accordance with the Constitution," he said.

During the summit, the head of the U.S. Administration emphasized, progress was also achieved on the question of the 50% reduction in Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals and this could become "another historic achievement."

However, at the same time the President reiterated that his administration has no intention of linking a reduction of strategic offensive arms with the implementation of the "Strategic Defense Initiative" which, according to his words, the United States will "never give up."

"Our fundamental line as regards SDI is simple. We will conduct research, test the system, and when it is ready we will deploy it," Reagan said.

New York, 13 Dec—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz described the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles as an agreement "which has opened up new opportunities for strengthening international security." "In addition," he writes in an article published today in THE NEW YORK TIMES, "this treaty removes specific and potential obstacles from the path toward the achievement of greater strategic stability at consistently lower levels of offensive arms."

The document that has been signed, Shultz emphasizes, contains "the most detailed and comprehensive system of verification to ensure its observance." The head of the U.S. foreign policy department expresses the view that when the Senate comes to discharge its constitutional powers it will recognize that the merits of the treaty speak for themselves. "We are confident that the results of the voting in the Senate will confirm the importance of the talks aimed at resolving difficult problems and will open a new chapter in the efforts to strengthen global stability," Shultz writes in conclusion.

Shultz, Romanians Cited on Missile Treaty
*PM141643 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
13 Dec 87 p 3*

[TASS report: "USSR-United States: Great Work Ahead"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] The international public and press are centering their attention on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington. Prominent foreign political and public figures and mass media organs note that this meeting has by and large justified the hopes of the peoples and has ended in a step unprecedented in the history of the nuclear age—the signing of a treaty beginning the process of nuclear disarmament. Certain progress has been revealed in the matter of a substantial reduction in strategic offensive armaments. But there is still great work ahead to strengthen international security. [passage omitted]

Washington, 11 Dec—U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz stressed in a TV interview that the "question of strategic armaments is" the core of national security. "If we intend to reduce them, we must do this jointly," he stated. The U.S. secretary of state expressed an opinion on the need "to get out of the habit of looking at the past and turn around to look to the future in an attempt to understand it and be guided by it." [passage omitted]

Bucharest, 11 Dec—AGERPRES reports: The Romanian press agency is empowered to state that the Government and people of Romania welcome with satisfaction the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-range Nuclear Missiles and believes that the conclusion of this important treaty is an important historic event and a victory for realism and reason, for the new thinking and approach to the questions of disarmament and peace.

IZVESTIYA Editorial: 'Hopes Justified'
PM151051 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
14 Dec 87 Morning Edition: 1

[Editorial: "Common Victory for Mankind"]

[Text] In recent years, and perhaps in decades, there has not been an event in the history of international relations which has aroused such constant attention and intense interest as the talks which took place in Washington between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Ronald Reagan, President of the United States. This may seem strange inasmuch as this is already the third meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders in the last 2 and 1/2 years.

But there is nothing odd about this. The familiarization in Geneva and the joint statement of great importance adopted there paved the way for Reykjavik. But in the Icelandic capital, although the agreement expected by the Soviet, U.S., and all other peoples was not signed during the dramatic talks which took place there, a military, political, and psychological breakthrough was made which prepared the ground for future accords.

Then M.S. Gorbachev visited Washington. "Mr Gorbachev," the U.S. President said in front of the television cameras, "mir na nas smotrit" ["the eyes of the world are upon us"], speaking these words, which he had learned specially, in Russian.

That is how it was. Millions of people directed their gaze at the U.S. capital, because people can no longer live in constant fear of the threat of nuclear annihilation; because the constant general tension, when you do not know what to expect tomorrow, has become unbearable. When the arms race is the direct cause of the starvation of hundreds of millions of people. When distrust, suspicion, and mutual fear have poisoned human life. When the thinning of the ozone layer, lack of oxygen, and catastrophic environmental pollution affect people.

Of course, no one expected that the leaders of the two leading powers for all their power could immediately resolve these problems which have accumulated for decades. But nonetheless there was confidence that the quantitative aspect would lead to a qualitative change and this time something extraordinary would happen, without which it would be impossible to go on.

These hopes were justified. As planned, in the first hours of their meeting the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President signed the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles; the first treaty initiating the process of the elimination of nuclear weapons, a treaty which the peoples had to suffer to achieve.

All people, including the older generation, want to live to the year 2000, to know what it will be like then in the 3d millennium. Although it is quite close to the 3d millennium—a little over 12 years—the expectation of something unusual which has never existed before is linked with it. Now—still in this century, this millennium—an extraordinary event which could change the future fate of mankind has occurred. Not only was the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles signed 8 December 1987 but the process of entering a nuclear-free world began.

You do not have to be an oracle to know that it will still be necessary to struggle for this nuclear-free world. But both the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and also the majority of mankind, which is in step with us, is ready for such a struggle.

The Washington visit also achieved much else. Yet, disagreements between the U.S. and the Soviet Union remain, and on some very serious questions. But all the same, we repeat, a lot was achieved. One not insignificant outcome of the meeting was the drawing up of a kind of agenda of joint work between our two countries for the future which outlines the prospects of dialogue and lends it a certain predictability. This is fully confirmed by the joint Soviet-U.S. summit statement adopted at the end of the talks.

This broad document geared to the future notes that the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President conducted all-embracing and detailed discussions on an entire range of questions of Soviet-U.S. relations.

These words enshrined in the Soviet and U.S. leaders' statement have great significance: "They will be guided by the conviction solemnly proclaimed by them that nuclear war must never be unleashed and can have no winner. They are fully determined to avert any war between the USSR and the United States—nuclear or conventional. They do not want to achieve military superiority." It is difficult to overestimate the significance of these words.

The statement indicates that the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles signed by the Soviet Union and the United States "is historic both in terms of its objective—the complete elimination of a whole class of Soviet and U.S. nuclear weapons—and in terms of the novelty and scale of the verification measures envisaged in it." In the full sense of the word these are unprecedented measures creating the basis of the verification

mechanism for future, even more important agreements. In a word, the signing of the Washington treaty is a historic, turning-point event. The treaty has ended one stage in the development of international relations and has become the prologue to another, which became clear during the talks.

The success of the talks between the CPSU Central Committee general secretary and the U.S. President was determined to a considerable extent by the real progress, backed up by specific accords, on the question of both countries reducing by half their strategic offensive arms. The Soviet Union and the United States are embarking on new work of gigantic importance.

Mutual understanding has also been achieved on the necessity to urgently resolve other problems of international life which have come to a head and require paramount attention—eliminating chemical weapons, stopping nuclear tests, and reducing conventional weapons and armed forces. The Soviet and U.S. leaders have achieved more mutual understanding than before in the approach to the search for a settlement of explosive regional conflicts. They have also agreed on a serious and responsible discussion of humanitarian questions, including human problems.

The approval expressed in the statement of the initiative to conduct joint research in the sphere of changes in the global climate and the environment on the basis of cooperation on such aforementioned questions arousing mutual concern as the protection and preservation of atmospheric ozone indicates in particular the scale and nature being assumed by Soviet-U.S. cooperation. Not the arms race but the protection of the dying environment—is it not this which the peoples of our two countries and the entire world community expect on the eve of the 21st century!

The Soviet Union and, as the meeting of the leaders of the Warsaw Pact states which took place in Berlin confirmed once again, the other socialist countries will do everything incumbent on them to make the arsenals of lethal weapons disappear from the face of the earth. To replace military rivalry, confrontation, and hostility with mutual understanding and peaceful cooperation among the peoples.

What has been achieved in Washington during M.S. Gorbachev's visit is a direct result of the socialist countries' coordinated actions, unity, sincerity, and persistent and consistent struggle to implement their integrated program of disarmament. But it is also a common victory for mankind and his common sense. It has become possible as a result of the selfless struggle of all peace-loving forces and social movements against the nuclear threat and the arms race and for a world in which there will no longer be a place for war and violence.

Gorbachev Impact on U.S. Public Weighed

PM141407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Dec 87
First Edition p 5

[Own correspondents V. Gan, V. Linnik, and V. Sukhoy dispatch: "The Dialogue Must Be Continued"]

[Text] Washington, 11 Dec—"When will you come back?" This question was addressed to the Soviet leader on Connecticut Ave on the last day of the visit when M.S. Gorbachev got out of his car to talk to Washingtonians. Over the past few days crowds of people could be seen in the center of the U.S. capital standing in the streets and on the sidewalks for hours in the hope of catching a glimpse of the Soviet leader and exchanging a few words with him. "Gorbachev watcher" ("a person waiting for a chance meeting with Gorbachev")—this is how journalists referred to these enthusiasts. Those waiting on Connecticut Ave at midday saw their hopes come true, as they subsequently related with satisfaction in their interviews.

The inhabitants of the U.S. capital showed genuine interest in the visit. This applies both to the "lucky few" whom we have just mentioned, and those who had been invited earlier to the official meetings with the CPSU Central Committee general secretary.

There were several such meetings. On the last day of his stay in Washington, M.S. Gorbachev talked to prominent representatives of the U.S. business circles. Soviet-U.S. trade, the Soviet leader noted, has now become an important factor in the USSR's domestic political development, a factor which assists the implementation of the radical economic reform in our country. If we depend more on each other in our economic relations then we will also adopt a more responsible attitude toward each other in politics, he said.

An interesting discussion about future trade relations between the USSR and the United States ensued. There is plenty to discuss. Opportunities for the development of mutually advantageous Soviet-U.S. trade exist and they are considerable. Its annual turnover at the moment is insignificant—2.5-3 billion dollars—and the imports of Soviet goods to the United States are ludicrously small—some 500 million dollars annually. The reasons for this? Protectionist barriers, high customs duties, arbitrary and unjustified "political linkage." For instance, the Jackson-Vanik and Stevenson amendments to trade legislation remain in force, which make the volume of trade and the granting of most-favored-nation status to our country directly dependent on the level of Jewish emigration from the USSR.

Of late a number of major U.S. companies have taken important steps in establishing closer U.S.-Soviet trade cooperation. They include Occidental Petroleum, Monsanto, Singer, and others.

However, right-wing circles immediately raised a rumour, saying that Moscow "has so far done nothing to prove that serious political changes have taken place in the country," and that therefore "the excessive zeal of certain corporations is premature." There is evidence of a bitter struggle of opinions, a clash of different viewpoints. Those who believe that "the worse, the better" cannot be right. Better for whom? Many of those who attended the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev said that the normalization and expansion of Soviet-U.S. relations, including economic relations, are in keeping with the fundamental interests of both our countries.

M.S. Gorbachev's press conference on the evening of 10 December was an event of major political significance. The club of the Soviet residential compound in Washington is huge. But even it was too small to accommodate all who wanted to come. Many leading lights in world journalism could not gain admission to the final event on the visit agenda.

A detailed report on the press conference will be published.

Immediately after the press conference we asked a number of journalists who had attended it to share their impressions.

James Jackson is bureau chief of the U.S. TIME magazine in Moscow.

"I am immensely impressed," he said. "M. Gorbachev gave clear answers and highlighted the main points to which paramount importance must be attached in Soviet-U.S. relations."

Steven Strasser, NEWSWEEK correspondent in Moscow: "The main thing, it seems to me, is that M. Gorbachev speaks the truth, no matter what it is. This commands respect. I believe that Americans have rated the visit of the Soviet leader so highly because they sense his sincerity. In the past 3 days they have learned more about the Soviet Union than in many past years. As for the press conference itself, you get the impression that you have learned something very exclusive, that you yourself have taken part in closed summit talks.

Ales Benda, chief editor of the popular Czechoslovak journal MLADY SVET: A very meaningful press conference. I believe that it will meet with a very wide response in the world. I would like especially to highlight the respect with which the CPSU Central Committee general secretary spoke about the socialist countries and their role in strengthening international security and the development of the international situation as whole.

In the evening, when M.S. Gorbachev was already on his way to Europe, President R. Reagan spoke on U.S. television. The U.S. President summed up the results of his talks with the Soviet leader. He described the visit as "3 historic days" and noted that the signing of the treaty

on medium-range and shorter-range missiles was a first but important step toward a lasting peace. He added: "Probably the most important step since World War II."

Kornilov on Western Reaction to INF Treaty
LD112114 Moscow TASS in English 2101 GMT
11 Dec 87

["The Soviet Union and the U.S.—Much Work Lies Ahead"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—By TASS Political News Analyst Yuriy Kornilov:

The third Soviet-American summit conference in two years has come to a close. A step has been made which has no precedent in the nuclear [words indistinct] Soviet Union and the United States signed a treaty under the terms of which the two strongest countries in strategic military terms pledged to really destroy a portion of their nuclear weapons. By doing so, the Soviet Union and the United States have marked the beginning of the process of nuclear disarmament and made a step closer toward a common goal—enhanced international security.

The significance of the new treaty which has been described with good reason as historic by prominent politicians and public figures in many countries cannot be overestimated. And not only for the reasons that in compliance with it two classes of lethally dangerous nuclear weapons will be scrapped for the first time in history. It seems that the most important thing is that it marks the beginning of the realization of the Soviet Union-proposed program for building a world without nuclear weapons, for it has been proved that if there is enough political will it is possible to make progress in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. And if that is so, if the Soviet Union and the United States have accumulated experience which can be very useful in the search for solutions to even more difficult problems related to universal equal security, we should move ahead boldly and vigorously and try to accomplish more.

Our country strongly favors the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. Our country stands for reaching an agreement that would commit to observe the ABM Treaty and not to withdraw from that treaty for a specified period of time. Our country advocates the elimination of chemical weapons and the reduction of conventional armaments. Our country would like the U.S.S.R. and the United States to make headway, while working consistently to lower the level of military confrontation, toward resolving other urgent problems, primarily those related to human rights and regional conflicts. It is now more evident than ever before that there is no such issue, be it conventional armaments, regional conflicts or human rights, on which mutual understanding could not be reached or headway made, provided, of course, that all these matters are approached seriously and in good faith.

Such an approach is hailed by sober-minded politicians, world public opinion and American opinion. However, the turn for the better has caused a different reaction—let us call things with their proper names—a diametrically opposite reaction among those quarters in the United States and NATO which still adhere with persistence worthy of a better use, to patterns of anti-communism and stereotypes of confrontation. So, today, while expressing profound satisfaction with the results of the Washington dialogue, we simply have no right to forget that those forces have not downed arms. Far from it.

This will be seen, for example, from efforts already made by certain quarters in the West to cast aspersions on the new treaty and particularly, from the postulate which they have already put in circulation by saying that in view of the prospective scrapping of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles Western Europe should urgently be "re-armed" through the deployment of new arms systems with nuclear warheads on the territory of a number of NATO countries.

The same is true of the current unsavory campaign in the United States the initiators of which, assuming the tone of a public prosecutor, are accusing the Soviet Union of "expansionism" and of "human rights violation." Simultaneously, the initiators of that campaign are trying to picture themselves as some kind of "champions of democracy", as was the case, for example, in the Presidential declaration just circulated by the White House on the occasion of Human Rights Day.

We stand—and the meetings in Washington have proved that yet another time—for wide-scale business-like and constructive discussions on all urgent and disputed issues, the problem of human rights included. But, it would be appropriate to ask, what does the effort to play up outright disinformation have to do with such a discussion? Why all these obsequious nods toward right-wing forces which are working not toward better mutual understanding, but in a diametrically opposite direction?

As a result of the Soviet-American summit conference in Washington the pointer of the international political barometer has at long last moved away from the mark "cloudy". There are grounds for hopes and optimism, but much work still lies ahead. Only time will show how the exceptionally important positive results of the Washington meeting will be transformed into practical actions.

As to the Soviet Union which is consistently looking for elements of concord even in a sea of differences, it always travelled and is travelling from the premise that the transition from confrontation to cooperation is possible and that it is in fact a must. And the Soviet Union is prepared to continue doing everything to attain that aim.

PRAVDA Comparisons on Official Statements

Reagan 9 Dec Dinner Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 10 December in its Second Edition on page 2 carries a TASS report on President Reagan's 9 December White House dinner speech under the general headline "To Build a Nuclear-Free World." A comparison of this version with the 9 December TASS in English item broadcast at 0522 GMT and published in the 9 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page 25 reveals the following variations: page 25: column two, paragraph seven, sentence two, the PRAVDA version reads: "...Secretary, we've always respected each other and been sincere. So let us..." (rewording); column two, paragraph nine, sentence two reads: "...of the first Soviet-U.S. arms control agreement..." (substituting "Soviet-U.S." for "U.S.-Soviet") page 26: Column one, paragraph two, sentence four, PRAVDA reads: "...of a responsibility that we have no right to slacken and that we cannot afford to shirk. I speak of..." (rewording) column one, paragraph four, only sentence PRAVDA omits "na vasha zdoroviya."

Gorbachev 9 Dec Dinner Speech

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 10 December 1987 in its Second Edition on page 2 carries a TASS report under the general headline "To Build a Nuclear-Free World". The PRAVDA version has been compared with the 9 December TASS in English report broadcast at 0320 GMT and published in the 9 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page 26, revealing the following variations: page 26: column one, paragraph five, PRAVDA reads: Esteemed Nancy Reagan (substituting "Nancy" for "Mrs") column two, paragraph five, only sentence, reads: "...of our discontent" (after the title of John Steinbeck's novel).

Today, after Reykjavik... (adding passage) column two, paragraph six, only sentence reads: "...say that the "winter" is waning. (adding quotation marks) column two, paragraph ten, last sentence reads: "...the name of medium- and shorter-range missiles.

I hope that... (substituting for "INF") page 27: column one, paragraph one, only sentence reads: "...my first toast is to this event.

It is dear... (substituting "this event" for "it") column one, paragraph three, only sentence, PRAVDA reads: "...of not only yours and our efforts, but..." (adding "yours and")

Joint Statement on Verification

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian in its 10 December 1987 Second Edition on page 3 carries an item under the headline "Statement of the USSR Foreign Minister and the U.S. Secretary of State." A comparison of this with the 10 December Moscow TASS in English version,

broadcast at 0025 GMT and published in the 10 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT on page 25, reveals the following variations: page 25: column two, PRAVDA omits paragraph six, introductory paragraph of item column two, last paragraph, first sentence reads: 17, 1987, the Soviet and U.S. sides are proceeding to... (substituting "Soviet and U.S. sides" for "U.S. and the USSR") page 26: column one, first paragraph, last sentence reads: ...may subsequently be drawn up.

For the purpose... (substituting "drawn up" for "reached") column one, paragraph four, sentence one reads: ...either side regarding monitoring methods proposed by... (adding "monitoring") same paragraph, sentence three PRAVDA reads: ...the basis for adopting a decision on those verification... (substituting "adopting a decision" for "agreeing") same paragraph, last sentence reads: ...these agreed verification methods.

In order to... (substituting "methods" for "measures") column one, paragraph six, first sentence reads: ...to help prepare and conduct the... (omitting "themselves to design") same paragraph, last sentence, PRAVDA reads: ...as the preliminary stage of the next... (substituting "stage" for "work")

Further Press Reportage on Summit Events

Gorbachev to 'Intelligentsia'

PM111251 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 87
Second Edition pp 1,2

[TASS report: "Building International Relations Is a Common Cause"]

[Text] Washington, 9 Dec—A meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and representatives of the U.S. public was held at the Soviet Embassy here Tuesday.

Taking part for the Soviet side were E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, and eminent scientists, writers, and masters of culture.

Also present were U.S. public figures, major representatives of science, culture, and art, people who have long played a prominent role in the country's life and influenced the formation of policy and public sentiment. M.S. Gorbachev had met with some of them before, in particular at the Moscow forum "For a nuclear-free world and for mankind's survival."

The participants in the meeting at the embassy included T. Gittins, president of the Town Affiliation Association of the United States; G. Kennan, former U.S. ambassador to the USSR; G. LaRocque, director of the Center for Defense Information; P. Montandon, president of the organization "Children as Teachers of Peace"; J. Randolph, president of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship; W. Fulbright, former chairman of

the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; G. Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States; S. Eisenhower, granddaughter of President Eisenhower and an activist in the antiwar movement; R. Adams, president of the Smithsonian Institute; K. Galbraith, the well-known economist; Prof B. Lown, U.S. cochairman of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War movement; astrophysicist C. Sagan; Prof M. Shulman of Columbia University; S. Drell [name as published], director of the Stanford University Center for Strategic Studies; the singer J. Denver; the actors R. de Niro and P. Newman; the singer and public figure Y. Ono, and others.

The meeting was addressed by M.S. Gorbachev. M.S. Gorbachev's Speech [subhead]

I am sincerely glad of this meeting and cordially welcome you to this hall. I value the fact that although you are very busy you left your work and responded to the invitation to meet here. And if there is a gesture of sincerity between us, that is highly significant. Therefore, I thank you for that sincerity. (applause)

In an interview with NBC, I mentioned that I have received 80,000 letters from Americans. That excludes those received here at the embassy. Incidentally, I receive between 70,000 and 120,000 letters a month from my fellow countrymen. So it is an appropriate mailbag.

Here is what Emily Holders, aged 17, writes: "Many Americans do not trust the Russians, and many Russians do not trust the Americans. We have many reasons not to trust them. They too, have many reasons not to trust us, but I feel that there is something missing here." That question is raised by a 17-year old. She continues: "We need a sense of common responsibility for our common survival, and for that reason we should come to grips with building a world of responsibility as if our lives depended on it. If we—the single human family—do not learn how to cooperate as a single species, we will inevitably be destroyed by our own creations. But if we learn to cooperate, think of the remarkable future that opens up." There you have a new philosopher in the making and, furthermore, with a good, optimistic vision. We have a good generation to succeed us. Another letter, addressed to President Reagan and me, bluntly asks: "Mr President and Mr General Secretary, you have seen much of life, and you are going to meet and discuss a question on which people's lives depend. Do it so that we can indeed live. Preserve the future."

I believe that something very serious is happening, something profound, which is already encompassing broad circles and strata of the population, both in the United States and the Soviet Union. It is the understanding that we cannot leave the relations between our peoples and our countries in such a state. And I thought:

Ferment in people's minds begins with ferment in the minds of the intelligentsia. It is the same agent in any society which generates new processes.

At the same time I had a thought and a question, which I shall put to you: Are the representatives of political circles and intellectual circles not lagging behind what the people are already realizing and have realized? It is still worth our while thinking about whether we in fact lag behind the mood of our peoples. That mood is clearly in favor of adjusting our relations and of rapprochement. Academician Velikhov showed initiative and organized an exchange between groups of schoolchildren. A group of U.S. children spent their summer vacation in Pereslavl-Zaleskiy near Moscow. What letters they wrote and what tape recordings they made! When they returned to the United States they produced a newspaper. It had the headline: "The Russians Are Coming!" (Laughter) They describe what kind of "onslaught" this is and what its consequences are. I was simply stunned at how deeply aware of what needs to be done our 12-, 13-, 14- and—the oldest—17-year olds are. And they hold us very much accountable.

That is why it seems to me that we have reached a crucial moment, when we, the politicians above all, bear a special responsibility—to fully express the feeling of the mass of people in favor of rapprochement and the improvement of relations.

Both at the Moscow forum and at the meeting with a group of prominent Americans, which included Mr Vance, Mr Kissinger, Mr Peterson, Mrs Kirkpatrick, and others, we said that it is now impossible to construct a confident and realistic policy unless there is a fusion of the efforts of politicians, scientific figures, scientists, and the artistic intelligentsia.

How many former ministers, secretaries of state, and ambassadors are there here today? But it is only later that they have become convinced that it is possible to defend their own country's interests well only if you take account of the interests of others. If you strive for a balance of interests. Indeed, the Soviet Union has interests, the United States has its own interests, India, Cambodia, and Bangladesh have their interests.... Everyone has his own interests. It seems to me very important that this realization should form the basis of building the new relations.

That is what I am leading up to. We are all children of our time, but there are new realities which dictate new imperatives—what we call the challenge of the time. Our accumulated experience is our wealth if it is correctly used and not left piled up in a heap, if lessons are learned and we compare how we acted before, in previous situations, when the world was different from the way it is now, and if we ask whether we can act in the modern world as we did 10 years ago or, even more so, 20 or 30 years ago. There are representatives of many theories

here—the theories of "war brinkmanship," of "deterrence," and of "rolling back...." But that has all gone now. I think that unless we—both we and you, the United States—understand that fact it will be hard to shift the world to a new track, to take the path of improving international relations and cooperation. And you know how that need is felt around us! It is knocking at the windows—the U.S. and Soviet windows—and we cannot remain deaf to what has now become urgent.

Such are the new realities. I think that we have grasped them, but perhaps we have not all understood them that thoroughly yet. We have tried to consider them and use them as the basis of our new analysis and our new vision of the modern world. And whereas before we stressed only the fact that we were different—we say this today, too, and this must be seen but not dramatized—then today we also emphasize that we are at the same time parts of a single civilization. We are interconnected—through science and technology, ecology, and the common threats which are increasing and making it necessary to pool our thoughts and actions. Is it not the intelligentsia's duty to convey that understanding to the peoples? I believe that it is. I said to the President today that it is desirable for a scientific element to be present in the elaboration and shaping of each state's policy and for the artistic intelligentsia to contribute a moral element to politics. To that end we are prepared not only for exchanges but for cooperation, too, and for meetings to consider the situation together from the standpoint of all mankind.

I see no reason to be upset because we are different. Take any family. People within the same family are different. If you take the international community—how can it be identical? This is the greatest phenomenon: We are all different, but at the same time, we belong to one civilization. Everything is interconnected. We remain different, but we are in one world, and just think what an intellectual contribution we—the Soviet Union and America—can make in particular from the viewpoint of understanding the new realities and how we can promote the restructuring of relations, first and foremost between our countries.

At this point, I would sincerely like to express my feelings about the present day and share my thoughts about where we are and what our common responsibility is. For example, I cannot understand those people who are hostile to the elements of cooperation and the elements of mutual understanding that appeared during the preparation of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. As a human being I cannot understand this, although there is an explanation: It is a matter of interests. Everything is due to interests. But there are different kinds of interests. There are the interests of the mass of people, including the American and Soviet peoples, and these interests are supreme. It is the task of the politicians to express those interests and not the narrow selfish interests of certain groups and strata in any given society.

We do not claim to be the ultimate authority on the truth on all questions, but we are ready to make our contribution. We possess forces that can be involved in this process of understanding the world and in the building of new relations. I think both our countries have tremendous potential here.

As for the second part of my speech, for the sake of information, I shall give you an idea of the situation regarding the restructuring of Soviet society at the present stage.

We began restructuring because we need it. We can no longer go on living as we have done until now. Economically, of course, we could have continued moving through inertia, and we still had a certain growth. We were achieving 2-3% growth in national income. But that is not the point. We tried to view our society as a whole and reached the main conclusion that we are not making use of the potential of the socialist system and its capabilities—from the viewpoint of the human factor and of maneuverability through the planned economy. We studied our society in order to understand it and ourselves and to discover what kind of a society we are living in. For that purpose, we needed glasnost and democratization. These, of course, are complex and very profound processes. Their purpose is not to undermine society. We want to understand it. And, having built a concept on the basis of an objective analysis, we want to travel this complex path in a sensible, well-considered way and by stages. We have begun that path.

A difficult search is in progress. The evaluation of the historical past is not always easy for us. We have had to call many things by their proper names. We have not said everything yet, and we have not investigated everything yet. But we have investigated the main matters, and that has provided a basis for the policy of restructuring. In brief, in 2 and 1/2 years, we formulated a view of the society in which we live and tried to look into the future, at the path we shall have to take. And we have gone forward. The process is not easy. There is nothing to hide. S.P. Zalygin, the editor of NOVYY MIR, is sitting here. From the example of his journal's work, he can describe the passions raging in all spheres of our society—in the political, economic, spiritual, moral, and social spheres.

We shall follow our chosen path; we simply have no alternative. Otherwise, the result will be stagnation, standstill. Our people will no longer accept that. But we shall proceed in such a way as to put the conservatives in their place and, at the same time, to prevent any skipping of stages and to prevent adventurism.

There have been very many meetings in the past 18 months to 2 years. Yes, this was necessary: Revolutions have always begun that way. All society is in motion. Now, at the next stage, there is an increasing amount of practical, difficult, serious, profound, and responsible work to be done. We have begun to fuse our concept with

life—this affects millions of people. The next 2-3 years will be the most painful. Everything must change, including political institutions and the economic situation. Some of you here today have written that we will not cope with the task because we are trying to resolve it on the basis of our socialist values. We shall see! I am convinced we shall succeed. We shall take from other economies those things appropriate to us, and we shall combine individual interest and social interest—via the appropriate mechanisms, the new economic mechanism, improved centralism, and elected leaders.

When a man depends on the results of economic management based on economic accountability [khozraschet], he will no longer tolerate the slacker or the incompetent person at the head of his enterprise. He now needs a knowledgeable, intelligent leader who is capable of successful work today and of seeing the future as well. That is why elections are necessary. That is why we are promoting the process of democracy in the economy, too. The planned economy enables us to carry out structural changes less painfully.

I believe that we have not even used one-half of our system's potential. Only now are we realizing what socialism really is and what it offers the present day. We are turning to Lenin, who, in his final years, gave much thought to the country's future and saw that something had begun to happen that was preventing socialism from developing as a system. We are trying to understand this idea of Lenin's but, of course, we are not trying mechanically to apply what he said to life today: Society, the country, and the people have changed greatly since then. We have worked thoroughly at ways of revealing socialism's potential—its economic and democratic potential, its political potential, and its spiritual and moral potential.

In addition, you must take account of the fact that over 90% of the population are people born since the revolution. They do not know any other structure or system. We will be refashioning our society on the bases and values of this system, as we understand it. That is our concern, and it is unclear why it should worry Americans. It is natural that our new thinking regarding the internal processes of the country and our approaches to them also affect our views on the world as a whole and our relations with that world. We consider that international relations also need "restructuring." However, we cannot impose it by a "decision of the CPSU." It must be the result of agreement by the whole world community and the interaction of all its component parts. We are open to dialogue, the comparison of views, and exchange; we respect the values and choice of every people.

We will steadfastly follow our own road, the road of restructuring, no matter how difficult it is. It will then be better....

As for economic relations with America, I do not know how we can put up with them any longer in such a state. We have virtually no ties with each other in this regard. True, this shows that you can live without us in this respect and we without you. But have we through our history really wanted to demonstrate this to each other? No. I think we have enormous mutual interest. Take our scientists and ask them how interested they are in meeting and exchanging ideas. It is important to them, I know this; they cannot manage without it. It is abnormal for scientists from the two major countries not to be in contact, not to mutually enrich themselves with ideas. The same applies in other spheres. I know, for example, the opinion of your business people....

The time has come when indeed everything must be considered—where we are, and the stage we have reached—and thought given to how we are to continue living together in this world. This may need 10, 20, 30, or 100 meetings before it is finally resolved. This question concerns our two peoples and all peoples. America and the Soviet Union must find a way to cooperate, to draw closer together, and also in the future to become friends. We will not hurry; we will not lapse into euphoria; we will be responsible. There is no need for illusions: These, after all, are the stubborn realities. At the same time, a beginning has to be made. Everything has to have a beginning.

If this visit and what has been generated in recent years in our relations has been nourished by present social attitudes and if they are moving in this direction, I think that means the ice has been broken. I, personally, am an optimist.

M.S. Gorbachev's speech was followed by an animated exchange of opinion concerning the ideas he had expressed. People from diverse professional backgrounds such as John Denver, William Fulbright, Bernard Lown, and Kenneth Galbraith assessed the state of Soviet-American relations from various aspects, but they all stressed the need to expand cooperation, contacts, collaboration, and mutual understanding.

P. Montandon, the president of the organization Children as Teachers of Peace, advocated expanding exchanges between American and Soviet schoolchildren. Replying to her, M.S. Gorbachev said that it is indeed essential to prepare a new generation that will approach relations between our countries differently in many respects. But we must sow the seeds right now, and then they will bear fruit.

Gorbachev Meets With Media Men

PM111801 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87
Second Edition pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Conversation at Soviet Embassy"]

[Text] Washington, 10 Dec—A conversation between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and leading U.S. mass media figures was held at the Soviet Embassy on 9 December.

Taking part were:

R. Bernstein, proprietor of Random House Publishers; K. Bessie [initial as published], director of the Harper and Row Publishing House; L. Boccardi, director general of THE ASSOCIATED PRESS agency; A. Vitale, president of Doubleday Publishers; K. Graham, chairman of the board of The Washington Post Company; T. Johnson, publisher of THE LOS ANGELES TIMES; M. Zuckerman, publisher and chief editor of U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT; D. Cohen, president of Collins Publishers; D. Quinn, chief editor of the newspaper USA TODAY; J. McManus, head of the Time Incorporated publishing house; G. Manning, vice president of NBC News [title as published]; T. Murphy, head of the board of directors of ABC; V. Otis, president of the Association of American Publishers; J. Piel, chairman of the board of Scientific American Incorporated; R. Wright, president of NBC; M. Vazquez Rana, president and chairman of the board of directors of the UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL Agency; S. Richardson, president of the Richardson and Steyrman [name as published] publishing house; R. Smith, chief editor of NEWSWEEK; B. Smith, president of International Publishers; S. Cook, publisher of the CHICAGO TRIBUNE; H. Stringer, president of CBS News; M. Tash, president of the Plenum Publishing Incorporated company; L. Tish, president of CBS; T. Turner, president of WTBS CNN; M. Frankel, chief editor of THE NEW YORK TIMES; W. Phillips, chairman of the board and chief editor of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL; W. Hyland, chief editor of the journal FOREIGN AFFAIRS; and S. Shepard, chief editor of the journal BUSINESS WEEK.

Addressing the guests, M.S. Gorbachev noted that the current visit is a business one. We have signed a treaty—the first act on elimination of nuclear weapons. This in itself is a tremendous event. We have held serious talks with the President and his staff on a wide range of problems. Substantial experience has already been accumulated, which permits us to carry on a constructive dialogue.

"We have now reached a stage, M.S. Gorbachev said, where in both our countries, among broad strata of the population and representatives of various circles a desire is manifesting itself to check and see whether in Soviet-U.S. relations we are doing everything as we should and as behooves our two peoples and our two great countries.

We have proved during the 40-odd postwar years that we can live without one another, without trading, and without maintaining contacts. But even in that situation, we were keenly aware of each other's presence. But should we be proving that we can live without each other? Maybe we should be proving something else in politics, in behavior, in dialogue. Maybe we should be seeking channels of communication, including through the news media.

The question arises: Have we become happier as a result of the arms race? Someone may say, yes, I am happy because I have made my pile with the military industry; another may say, I am happy because I have obtained greater profit for my newspaper or magazine as a result of the arms race, as a result of the "cold war." But surely there cannot be many people who are indifferent to the destiny of the people, the destiny of the country, and now also the destiny of our entire civilization, who are prepared to let everything go under the hammer, just to add to their profits? I do not think that at the present level of development such people are in the majority. No, despite everything, the most prevalent feeling in the world is a feeling of responsibility and concern for where the world is going.

People say bluntly: When will we learn to live normally, to conduct our affairs normally? There must be no looking back for stereotypes and modes of behavior. That would mean becoming entangled and unable to pull ourselves out of this tense situation.

I am confident: We must consider the present situation in the world, look at it realistically. If we do this, we will find solutions in various areas—in dialogue, disarmament, in the economy.

In their contributions those present emphasized the importance of strengthening trust and development of cooperation between the U.S. and the Soviet news media. T. Turner, president of a television corporation, said for instance:

Most of the representatives of the mass media present here know that, to a considerable degree, the future of Soviet-U.S. relations depends also on them. My experience of contacts with my colleagues in the Soviet Union indicates that we can build these relations well, and I think that today is the very day when we can be proud of the fact that we are living on the earth, that we are all human beings. It is possible to say today that the arms race has simply destroyed the U.S. economy in comparison with, for instance Japan, and has caused damage to the Soviet economy. I have been in the Soviet Union more than once. There are good and wonderful people there, just like in the United States. Of course, we could criticize each other ad infinitum. But what good will this do? It is necessary to take a broad view; it is necessary to cooperate; it is necessary to believe and trust one another. I try to do this. I have been in the Soviet Union, I have traveled all over the place unarmed and unprotected. Anybody could have done anything they wanted to me. But nothing like that happened. People treated me as a friend. I believe that many people present here could do a great deal to build bridges between our countries. It is a very good thing that U.S. television has been reporting on the Soviet Union in a more amicable spirit over the past 2 years, and this trend is growing. It must be developed,

because if we give up the arms race we will also ensure the successful development of our economy. There simply is no other solution. I would like all representatives of the U.S. news media present here to work for the good of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The publisher R. Richardson recalled the contribution made by U.S. and Soviet scientists in achieving the agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles. In Pugwash 30 years ago, he noted, scientists met not simply as representatives of their countries but precisely as Einstein and Russell had exhorted them to do—as members of the human race. They discussed the most difficult issues, including the nuclear arms race. They quickly came to the conclusion that arms cannot serve any sensible political purpose. Then they set about laying the technical foundations for the mutual trust which we need, tackling verification problems, and it was precisely on these difficult issues that they managed to reach agreement. They then returned to their own countries and set about working and trying to convince their governments that there is a good technical and scientific basis for implementing disarmament. Now, at last, the first agreement, in accordance with which a whole class of nuclear weapons is to be destroyed, has been reached. It follows from this that it is necessary to listen to the scientists, both in our country and in the Soviet Union.

For his part, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized: I believe that we all made a mistake when we did not heed what Einstein and his fellow thinkers were saying. They warned that the world had obtained a force which demands a new approach. This was not treated with sufficient responsibility, and now the fruits of this disrespectful attitude to the opinion of scientists are being reaped. We need the opinion of scientists, their expertise. We have witnessed how the world has heeded the opinion of the "International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War." Lown and Chazov set this idea in motion, and you can see how it has been received throughout the world. It is because people who know what they are talking about, who can imagine what would happen if a nuclear conflict broke out, have spoken out. This has made a colossal impact.

At present, contacts between our scientists are being established in the sphere of physics and mathematics. Scientists made many valuable suggestions which enabled us to find approaches to formulating the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. During the talks, we proposed that a committee of Soviet and U.S. scientists be set up. Let them convey their assessments to the leadership so that we know the worth of the various political decisions we have adopted.

The representatives of the leading news media showed particular interest in restructuring and glasnost in the Soviet Union.

As for our problems, we have identified them and have embarked on the road of renewal and improvement of the political institutions, democracy, national economic management, and the enrichment of spiritual life alike. We have termed our plans restructuring. Our main task is to evoke the people's interest in all this and to make them real participants in the effort of restructuring. This cannot be achieved without the mass media and without glasnost. Therefore, we will expand glasnost and encourage constructive and critical activity and responsibility. There is no call for sensations and scandalous facts here. What is needed are ideas capable of capturing the minds and hearts of people, of evoking the desire in people to lift up their country, to find their place in the common cause. Naturally, in the course of this process, there are clashes of opinion. The press must reflect this realistically, proceeding from civic positions rather than pursuing the aim of selling the biggest number of copies of this or that newspaper. The main thing is to ensure that society gets answers to perturbing questions through the mass media.

We will develop the constructive, democratic, and critical activity of our news media. They have helped us during the first stage, and we are counting on their help also during the next stage of the implementation of our plans. Here, too, we are hoping for the help of the press, for its active participation. However, not even the press itself can be beyond control and beyond criticism. It, in turn, is the target of both criticism and control on the part of the people.

I believe that the biggest and most solid guarantee, a reliable guarantee, that these processes will follow a positive and stable trend lies in the fact that politicians are being thoroughly monitored by the peoples. Also, broad scientific and cultural circles are wholeheartedly joining in the process of international politics. Clearly, the peoples of our countries and the whole world are tired of looking on how politicians fail to respond to the imperatives of the present-day world. The synthesis of politics, science, and culture and the coming to the fore and active participation in international politics of public movements guarantees that it will no longer be possible to manipulate peoples, as has been the case in the past. Everyone has recognized that this is no way to proceed. In this I see the main guarantee. Politics has left the offices and the corridors of power. It has now entered the vast expanses of international life, and people who are interested in preserving peace are actively joining in.

During the conversation U.S. editors also raised questions pertaining to the observance of human rights in the USSR with reference to so-called facts frequently featured in the U.S. mass media.

M.S. Gorbachev said: Your information does not correspond to reality in the least. In our country, the concept of "political crimes" does not exist at all: There are crimes against the state. We will defend our

system against those who want to undermine it, just like any other state. Why, if capitalism and bourgeois law have the right to defend the bourgeois system, should this right be denied to socialism?

Why should what is recognized as legal in the United States be considered illegal in the Soviet Union?

The President asked me yesterday: Why do you set quotas on emigration from your country? Why don't you let all those who want to leave go?

I replied: Mr President, and why do you set quotas for entry into your country? On the border with Mexico, barbed wire barriers have been erected, people with machine guns are guarding the border to prevent people from Mexico coming into your country. You demand unlimited emigration from the Soviet Union, what kind of a view is this. The President replied: We cannot take in all the Mexicans.

What makes you think that they will all abandon their homeland, Mexico, and come to the United States?

We have now let out everyone who wanted to go. We are not letting out people who have worked at defense enterprises, who have connections with computer technology and with development of weapons and control systems; they are party to state secrets. Every state protects its secrets. Why should we be stupid enough to be indifferent to the fate of the state and its defense capability?

Let us not speculate on these questions but take a look instead at the concept implemented in U.S. legislation, and we will see that it ignores socioeconomic rights. The whole world criticizes America for this. The United States has failed to sign international pacts on this subject. Why should it have a moral right to assume the stance of teacher in relation to the rest of the community? Who has given it the right to preach to us? Yesterday I said to the President: You, Mr President, are not the prosecutor, and I am not the accused.

If you want a discussion on this or other questions in a broad context, let us discuss them, through the press, for instance.

Our press has now offered space to Western correspondents, publishing their articles unabridged, openly. The newspaper IZVESTIYA, for instance, published in full the interview with the U.S. President containing his accusations leveled against the Soviet leadership. We are not afraid of criticism. Your criticism is frequently unconvincing. It is disrespectful toward our people; therefore, it fails to evoke respect. It can only be taken seriously by groups of extremists who are dissatisfied with society.

M.S. Gorbachev cited specific examples of disinformation using all kind of rumors and gossip, which are then picked up by the Russian sections of the Voice of America, the BBC, and others. If, the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee said, the Western media are trying to present the Soviet Union in a bad light, it must mean that we have embarked on a good course and that we are tackling great things in the course of restructuring. If they are trying to undermine interest in our policy, it means that restructuring is a serious cause, both for us and the world.

Concrete proposals for exchanges of Soviet and U.S. publishing house editors were put forward during the conversation.

M.S. Gorbachev backed this idea. The idea of contacts and deeper mutual understanding as such is very important, he said. The Soviet comrades present here will give some thought to these questions and formulate organizational forms.

United States & Canada

Shultz Against Nonnuclear Northern Europe

LD142110 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1617 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Excerpt] Moscow, 14 Dec (TASS)—Vasiliy Kharkov, a TASS Observer, writes:

The signing of the treaty on the elimination of two classes of Soviet and U.S. nuclear missiles, plus the shift that has taken place toward reducing strategic offensive weapons open up fresh prospects for military detente in Europe. In these conditions, the chances of implementing the idea of a nonnuclear north of Europe are becoming more favorable. However, speaking at a press conference in Copenhagen Sunday, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz again spoke out against a nonnuclear status for northern Europe and rejected the very idea of creating a nonnuclear zone there. Thus, it was confirmed for the umpteenth time that the north of Europe is regarded by the NATO leadership as a military and strategic outpost right on the borders of the Soviet Union and its allies. [passage omitted]

Defense Budget Reduced for 'Political Reasons'

LD142236 Moscow Television Service in Russian
2000 GMT 14 Dec 87

[From "The World Today" program presented by Igor Fesunenکو]

[Text] [Fesunenکو] A recent marked—not very strong, but quite tangible—trend to reduce military expenditure can, I think, be considered to some extent a consequence of a gradual change in the political moods and atmosphere in the United States. I refer not only to the moods of, say, liberal circles, but also to congressmen advocating a gradual reduction in the Pentagon's share of the federal budget. For the first time in many years, comrades, the U.S. defense secretary himself has initiated a certain, not big, but nevertheless a reduction in expenditures by his department.

This was reported recently, quoting high Pentagon officials and members of Congress, by THE NEW YORK TIMES observer Richard Halloran. According to his figures, the new Pentagon chief, Frank Carlucci, has ordered various armed services to cut their budgets for the next fiscal year, 1989; and the Pentagon budget by nearly \$33 billion, which constitutes a cut of more than 10%.

Of course, it would be naive to see in this a direct casual relationship to the Soviet-U.S. summit. Halloran says the need for this reduction—or rather it is not he who says it, but he reports that this is considered in the Pentagon—is caused by the federal budget deficit and spending directives drafted by the White House and congressional leaders.

But official Defense Department spokesmen who requested anonymity thought this step by Carlucci, which is clearly unusual, was taken not only for economic but also for political reasons. This step testifies to the tactics chosen by the new secretary in relations with Congress, and demonstrates an attempt to establish a record in fiscal toughness in defense matters that the Republicans would be able to quote during the presidential campaign.

As a result of these reductions, the military budget to be submitted to Congress next winter will be less than the \$323.3 billion planned last year by Carlucci's predecessor and mentor, Caspar Weinberger. The planned allocations amounting to \$290 billion will also be below \$296 billion, the level envisaged for military programs and that had already been approved by Congress for this fiscal year and signed on 4 December by President Reagan.

It should be remembered here that in the U.S. Congress and press alike, and in statements by many politicians and public figures, warnings have long been heard that the unrestrained growth in military expenditures over the past few years will eventually deadlock the federal budget. It looks as if these warnings are beginning to come true. The astronomical U.S. budget deficit is beginning to convince even the defense secretary that it is dangerous to continue on the previous course.

Tolkunov's 30 Nov Meeting With U.S. Visitors

PM071637 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Dec 87
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] On 30 November L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the Union, met with members of a delegation of the American Center of International Leaders, which is in our country at the invitation of the USSR Youth Organizations Committee.

During the talks, the guests were briefed on the extensive changes taking place in the USSR in the socioeconomic and political spheres and on the development of the processes of democratization and glasnost. The importance of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting was noted during the discussion of international problems and questions connected with the state of bilateral relations and their development prospects. It was emphasized that the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles will be an important practical step on the way to a nuclear-free world.

The members of the U.S. delegation expressed satisfaction with the opportunity afforded them to familiarize themselves with the processes of restructuring in the

USSR and with the life of Soviet young people. They hailed the steps aimed at achieving disarmament in the interests of peace and international cooperation.

S.N. Chelnokov, chairman of the USSR Youth Organizations Committee, participated in the talks.

Kachanov on Joint Ventures With U.S. Firms
*LD041018 Moscow TASS in English 1716 GMT
3 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—The negotiations held recently with senior executives of a number of U.S. companies showed that there are opportunities to extend the participation of U.S. firms in implementing joint industrial projects in third countries, Aleksandr Kachanov, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations, said in a TASS interview.

He emphasized that drawing each other in building such projects on a mutually profitable basis could become the most optimum way of deepening bilateral ties in this field.

The re-export of miscellaneous equipment is now one of the most widely practiced forms of cooperation in third countries. The foreign trade associations of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations maintain business contacts with such U.S. companies as "Honeywell", "Westinghouse", "Occidental Petroleum Corporation", "Dresser Industries" and others. True, I would like to note that the share of U.S. companies in the overall volume of our associations' re-export operations involving Western firms has not exceeded 15 per cent as yet.

In the long term, other forms of business relations are also possible. Among them are joint appearances in consortia, co-production, the setting up of joint enterprises with a partial orientation of their output at third country markets which are traditional to the partners. The reform of foreign economic relations, enacted in the USSR, the right to a direct outlet to foreign markets granted to new Soviet associations and enterprises create conditions for this, Kachanov said.

A great role in establishing mutually profitable business contacts belongs to the U.S.-Soviet Trade and Economic Council. Being concurrently a senior executive of this organisation, I hold that it would be expedient to hold during a regular annual session of the council meetings of senior officials of the USSR State Committee for Foreign Economic Relations and its foreign trade associations with representatives of U.S. companies that have a stake in boosting business ties with Soviet partners. It is important that these meetings be prepared in advance, including by the U.S. side as well. This will make it possible to outline specific accords on cooperation already in the period of the holding of the council session.

Claims Over Journalists in DRA 'Groundless'
*LD042201 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT
4 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 4 TASS—TASS Political News Analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

As it becomes ever more obvious that an opportunity for a considerable improvement of the international situation opens to the world, those circles in the USA that are against any changes for the better in Soviet-American relations intensify their actions. The so-called Afghan problem has been chosen as one of the pretexts for the heightening of tension, for the stepping up of anti-Soviet hue-and-cry. Quite recently, the Voice of America, in a commentary which claimed to be reflecting the viewpoint of the U.S. Government, asserted that Soviet and Afghan troops implement a "tactic of terror" against the peaceful Afghan population, use booby-traps against children. These vicious falsehoods have been resolutely refuted.

No sooner had a soap bubble burst than specialists in propaganda gimmicks started whipping up anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet attitudes. They are shedding crocodile tears about what they describe as a "disappearance" in Afghanistan of two American journalists, Lee Shapiro and James Lindelof.

As is known, the Soviet side has given a clear and exhaustive answer to the U.S. request in this connection. And since definite circles in the USA, striving to continue to the attempts at worsening the international atmosphere shortly before the Washington summit, continue rehashing this case. It should be stated clearly again that the "claims" to the USSR are absurd claims.

Indeed, were these persons innocent children, or inquisitive tourists who set themselves the aim of visiting Afghanistan to see the sights and mountain landscapes of that country? No. The case involves two representatives of the U.S. bourgeois mass media who, in gross violation of generally recognized international laws, decided to enter an independent sovereign country through a back entrance, with one of armed counter-revolutionary bands.

Taking such a step, Shapiro and Lindelof surely realized that it was an illegal and dangerous undertaking. They surely knew that Afghan counter-revolutionaries were armed mercenaries, waging an undeclared war against the peaceful Afghan population, terrorising peaceful villages, desecrating mosques, destroying roads and shooting down airliners by U.S. "Stinger" rockets. They surely knew all this, ever more so since, as an ASSOCIATED PRESS report indicates, they had already made such an illegal "expedition" to Afghanistan before. So they should have realized that counter-revolutionaries might involve them in another bloody operation with all the possible serious consequences to follow.

L. Shapiro and J. Lindelof have "disappeared", the U.S. side declares. Without assuming the task of specifying what precisely this formula means, one might surmise that they have "disappeared" first of all as a result of the fact that the band which the U.S. journalists had joined was routed and dispersed, just as many other bands sent into Afghanistan. Quite possibly, the "Afghan voyage" had a sorry ending for Shapiro and Lindelof. It will not be amiss to recall in this connection that the Afghan News Agency BAKHTAR noted in one of its statements that the authorities of the Republic of Afghanistan give the necessary aid and assistance to foreign journalists, but that in conditions of the continued undeclared war they cannot guarantee the safety of foreign citizens who get into the country illegally, within bandit groups. And why should the Afghan authorities give such guarantees?

So, whatever view one might take of this case, one cannot overlook the stark facts that the U.S. journalists penetrated a sovereign country as members of an armed counter-revolutionary band, that they knew what they were doing and that they alone and those who gave them a permission and possibly edged them on to an illegal trip bear the responsibility for what has happened. The responsibility also rests on heads of counter-revolutionary units who, as is known, call Western journalists into their headquarters, trying to get their assistance in passing themselves as "protectors of Islam", "fighters for the independence of Afghanistan".

In the light of all this one would like to wish that representatives of the Western mass media who eagerly seek dubious "sensations", their masters and patrons should learn the lesson from this case. As to the attempts of definite circles in the USA, distorting the essence of what has happened, to send the public opinion on a wrong track, to make some "claims" to the USSR, one can only repeat what has already been said in Moscow, that any claims to the USSR are groundless and that it cannot bear any responsibility for the consequences of an illegal entry of American journalists into Afghanistan. The responsibility for such illegal actions which are absolutely justifiably viewed in Kabul as attempts at interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs rests completely on those who make such ventures, on counter-revolutionary mercenaries and those circles in Washington that unleashed the undeclared war against the sovereign non-aligned country and continue putting obstacles to a prompt and effective solution to the "Afghan problem".

Briefs

U.S. UN Association Visits

Representatives of business circles, the public, and scientists from the United States are participating in a meeting on economic problems in Moscow, which is carried out by the Soviet and U.S. Associations of Assistance to the United Nations. Topical problems were discussed in the situation and in the prospects for the

trade and economic relations between the two countries, including the possibilities of more active use of modern forms of interaction, cooperation, and joint enterprises. Also discussed were the problems of the influence of the processes of restructuring in the Soviet Union upon its participation in the international division of labor, issues concerning mutual contacts, problems of economic cooperation, the implementation of disarmament measures, and the role of regional and international economic organizations. [Text] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 3 Dec 87 LD*]

Northeast Asia

Adamishin Briefs Japanese on Summit Results
OW151141 Tokyo KYODO in English 1050 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 15 KYODO—Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin said Tuesday the Soviet Union saw the U.S.-Soviet summit in Washington last week as a way out of the long confrontation between the two countries.

He also said the total abolition of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) at the summit, including their elimination from Asia, stemmed from the "goodwill" of the Soviet side, a foreign ministry official told reporters.

Adamishin, here to explain to Japanese Vice Foreign Minister Ryohei Murata and other officials the outcome of the Washington summit, hailed the signing of the INF treaty and also what he said was "remarkable" progress made toward the reduction of strategic nuclear weapons.

He said only the Soviet Union was removing INF from Asia and that this was out of "goodwill," according to the official.

Murata was quoted as saying the INF removal was only a step toward the total elimination of nuclear weapons and cautioned the Soviet side concerning its increased military action in Asia.

Another Japanese official noted that Japan had its territorial airspace violated by a Soviet reconnaissance plane in the 20th intrusion of its kind since 1967, during the summit last Wednesday, which he said reflected expanded Soviet military activity, the official said.

Adamishin said the summit talks saw a change in tone on regional issues, explaining that the two countries had stopped discussing past history and started to talk about what they can actually do. He also said the summit saw "progress" on the human rights issue.

Murata, however, said he had to say that few results came out of the summit in connection with the Afghanistan and Iran-Iraq war problems. He asked for the Soviets to improve the regional situation with action.

Murata said Japan was disappointed with the Soviet Union's unchanged attitude at the summit on the Soviet-held northern islands over which Japan claims sovereignty, the official said.

USSR-Japan Fail To Conclude Fishing Agreement
OW150043 Tokyo KYODO in English 0013 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 14 KYODO—Japanese Fishery Agency officials left here for home Monday after failing to conclude a new fishery pact with the Soviet Union.

Japanese officials said the two countries are far apart over the amount of fishing fees to be paid for Japanese fishing rights in Soviet waters.

In the course of on-and-off negotiations since November 24, Japan proposed to pay 1,160 million yen for 100,000 tons of catch while the Soviet Union demanded 2,350 million yen, the officials said.

A senior Fishery Agency official, saying a compromise is unlikely, departed from the Soviet capital to get new instructions from the government.

Japanese Fishery Agency officials will return to Moscow December 23 for another round of talks December 24-25.

During the latest round, officials said, the Soviet Union made fresh proposals such as inspection of Japanese fishing vessels in newly designated fishing zones and a ban on dragnet fishing in certain areas.

Tokyo 'Washes Its Hands' of KAL Incident
PM141622 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 87
Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent I. Latyshev report under the rubric "Echo of Events: Rumors, Facts": "Tokyo Washes Its Hands"]

[Text] Tokyo—For more than 10 days the Japanese mass media have been keenly following the investigation into the circumstances of the mysterious disappearance on 29 November of a South Korean airliner with 115 passengers on board during a flight from Abu Dhabi to Rangoon.

How can this be explained—after all, there were no Japanese passengers on the plane at the time of the disaster?

No, but something else has emerged: Two people with Japanese passports, Sinichi Hachiya and Mayumi Hachiya, listed on the document as "father" and "daughter," boarded the ill-fated plane earlier, in Baghdad, and then left it at its first stop in Abu Dhabi, from where they immediately set off by a different plane for Manama (Bahrain), where they ordered air tickets in the other

direction—to Rome. Later, when the pair was arrested at Manama airport because of doubts over the authenticity of their passports, both took poison from an ampoule concealed in a packet of cigarettes. Four hours later the "father" was dead, while the "daughter" was soon back on her feet, thanks to the assistance of doctors.

In subsequent days the Japanese police sent a group of investigators to Manama to find out to what extent these persons with Japanese passports were involved in the disappearance of the South Korean airliner (which incidentally, it has yet to be discovered where it crashed). The investigators' working hypothesis was that the "father" and "daughter" planted a delayed-action bomb on the plane during the flight between Baghdad and Abu Dhabi.

A group of South Korean police also arrived in Manama, from Seoul, with the same hypothesis.

Terrorism on the airlines is a crime which cannot be tolerated. Naturally, the Japanese public would like to know the truth, who is to blame for the crime. However, at the same time, the statements of police authorities here clearly showed, from the very first days, only one desire, namely: At all costs to dissociate Japan from involvement in everything that happened and to give the public the impression that the people detained in Bahrain are "agents" of some foreign country. In this connection, provocative hints are made in the direction of the DPRK, but all the initial police conjectures concerning the interpretation of what happened failed to find confirmation. Moreover, reports from Bahrain indicate that the threads making it possible to clarify the question of who the "father" and "daughter" really are, and whether they are involved in the loss of the South Korean airliner lead first and foremost to Japan and South Korea.

It emerged from Japanese press reports, in particular, that this suspicious pair's false passports and medical certificates were manufactured in Japan, using the names and addresses of real citizens of that country, that at least one of the suspects, the "father," spoke "pure Japanese," and that they signed hotel registers in Japanese characters. It is no accident that articles have appeared in the South Korean press condemning Japanese Government circles, the police, and the press "for attempting to deny Japan's connection with the plane that disappeared."

The noninvolvement of Japanese citizens in everything that happened is also doubted by competent political experts here, who draw attention to the recent, abrupt increase both in Japan and abroad in the activity of secret organizations of Japanese extreme left terrorists.

Today the press reported that the Japanese and South Korean investigators in Manama have carried out additional interrogations of the detained girl with the false Japanese passport. According to reports published in the

press, the suspect apparently told the Japanese side that she is not Japanese, but Chinese by extraction. This statement gave the Japanese authorities a pretext for handing over all further investigations to the Korean side. Under an agreement between Japanese and Korean officials, the suspect will now be sent to South Korea. As yet it is hard to say how the subsequent investigation there might develop in concrete terms.

ROK Opposition Warns Against Election Fraud
SK150136 Moscow International Service in Korean
0930 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Text] Kim Tae-chung, presidential candidate of the South Korean dissident forces, stated that the Seoul authorities would buy over voters to ensure victory for the candidate of the ruling party in the election slated for 16 December. He stated this at a mass rally held in the capital of South Korea participated in by approximately 1 million people. A demonstration attended by hundreds of thousands of people followed. Participants in this demonstration chanted slogans supporting Kim Tae-chung.

No Tae-u, presidential candidate of the ruling party, also held a stumping speech in Taegu on the same day. As this (?retired general) delivered a speech, workers hurled a tear gas canister at the podium.

According to reports by foreign news agencies, the military and the police have assumed a posture of high alert status in South Korea.

New Ambassador to DPRK Presents Credentials
LD130037 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1432 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Pyongyang, 12 Dec (TASS)—G.G. Bartoshevich, the new ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the USSR in the DPRK, presented his credentials to Kim Il-song, president of the DPRK, today.

A conversation was held after the presentation ceremony. The Soviet ambassador handed the general secretary of the WPK [Workers Party of Korea] Central Committee a personal message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

MPR's Namsray Hails Signing of INF Treaty
LD131417 Moscow Television Service in Russian
1530 GMT 12 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; remarks by Ts. Namsray, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party—captioned; in Mongolian with Russian translation superimposed]

[Text] The Mongolian people received with profound satisfaction the news that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan have signed in Washington the

Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles. That treaty is a historic breakthrough in the cause of disarmament, the result of the wholesome influence of the new political thinking on the international atmosphere.

In the period of just over 4 decades since U.S. atom bombs incinerated Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world has been travelling the dreadful road of accumulating nuclear weapons. Now two entire classes of those weapons are to be destroyed; moreover, not because they have become obsolete, but because they are too dangerous for mankind. However, the significance of the document that has been signed does not stop at this. Real prospects have materialized for taking yet another step forward by preparing an agreement for a 50% reduction in offensive weapons, while strictly adhering to the ABM Treaty. The Washington meeting also marks the start of the implementation of mankind's hopes of entering the 21st century without weapons capable of destroying life on earth.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Asia-Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Concept Viewed
LD141537 Moscow World Service in English
0110 GMT 14 Dec 87

[Commentator Victor Ivanov]

[Excerpts] Experts in various countries, including those in Asia and the Pacific, are now considering what measures to bring about disarmament and strengthen confidence should follow the signing of the Soviet-American treaty in Washington. Various answers have been suggested. The diversity of opinion reflects the broad range of problems facing Asian and Pacific countries. There have been calls for lessening naval confrontation, reducing strategic arms and conventional forces in the region, and settling regional conflicts. However, the general feeling is that the Soviet-American treaty has laid a good groundwork for progress in all of these areas. For instance, prerequisites have been created for achieving an agreement between the Soviet Union and the United States on strategic offensive arms. That agreement is likely to be ready already by the next summit, scheduled for the first half of next year. An opportunity has been taking shape to coordinate a common attitude to and ensure compliance for a certain period with the Antiballistic Missile Treaty. The Soviet and American leaders also discussed conventional arms reductions, a nuclear test ban, regional conflicts, and a number of other issues. Thereby an emphasis has been given to positive processes and the main thing now is to keep them going.

Asian and Pacific countries have large opportunities for that. Their concept of the work against the nuclear threat and concrete measures along these lines largely promoted the Soviet-American agreement. [passage omitted] As you may remember, New Zealand's decision to

ban nuclear armed ships from its ports has been extensively supported. A massive movement continues for declaring entire seas and provinces nuclear-free. Great efforts have been exerted to settle conflicts and differences by political means. There are clear signs that all these trends have heavy support in Asia and the Pacific and are paving the way for future agreements.

The proposal for granting a nuclear-free status to the entire Pacific is one of the most crucial ideas. A call for this came from the recent Manila conference of 30 Asian and Pacific countries. The United States' attitude, however, is the main obstruction in the way of implementing this idea. The London magazine *THE ECONOMIST* said that Washington is concerned about its military interests in the region and reacted coolly to this proposal from the outset. In contrast to this, the Soviet Union has promised to guarantee the nuclear-free status of the South Pacific and has suggested testing a number of measures in the north of the ocean. [passage omitted]

It might seem that the diversity of proposals and ideas of how the situation can be normalized and disarmament achieved in Asia and the Pacific is an obstacle in the way of achieving concrete results. But the experience the Soviet Union and the United States earned as they drafted the just signed agreement proved that even sharp differences can be settled. [passage omitted]

Antinuclear Trend in ASEAN Hailed

*BK110355 Moscow in Indonesian to Indonesia
1300 GMT 10 Dec 87*

[Station observer's commentary: "Nuclear-Free Zone in Southeast Asia Contributes to Disarmament"]

[Text] Regardless of topics to be discussed by participants of the forthcoming Manila meeting, such a representative association as ASEAN will, in the opinion of many observers, definitely draw attention to security and disarmament issues. Moreover, ASEAN has taken a very important political initiative, such as the proposal for creating a nuclear weapons-free zone in Southeast Asia. The issue, which was recently disclosed by Indonesian Foreign Minister Mokhtar Kusumaatmaja, draws the attention of all leaders of the six ASEAN member countries and is to be included in the closing communique. It seems that never before has the proposal been more concrete and the international situation for practical steps to materialize it as favorable as now.

The Soviet-U.S. agreement on medium- and short-range guided missiles is a strong factor to stimulate development of an antinuclear tendency in world politics in general and certain regions in particular. A possible realistic and mutually acceptable approach to security issues was shown in preparing for the Washington meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan.

This tendency is also of deep significance for Southeast Asia, which forms part of the vast Asia-Pacific region. According to the *MERDEKA* newspaper, the peoples of the countries situated in this region are concerned because their homelands are being turned into the Pentagon's arsenals. There are now hopes among these countries that security can be ensured not by increasing but instead by decreasing the level of military conflict. The agreement on medium- and short-range guided missiles shows that the human beings [words indistinct] have been mature enough a denuclearization process. Against this background, the buildup of strategic nuclear forces sponsored by the militaristic circles in the West appears to be something totally outdated. However, the awareness of this truth [words indistinct] for further steps toward reducing the nuclear danger. The present-day world can no longer be regarded merely as an arena for action by nuclear countries, and countries which have no nuclear weapons can no longer passively watch events on which their fate also depends.

Commenting on the Soviet-U.S. agreement, Australia's *CANBERRA TIMES* writes that other countries can also contribute to the disarmament process by presenting their own proposals. It should also be added here that the proposals calling for denuclearization will become a concrete factor at present only if they are reflected in the political action of the governments and organizations concerned. In our opinion, viewed from this point, there appears the real significance of possible further steps by the ASEAN countries to turn Southeast Asia into a nuclear-free zone.

What will be the results of the success of this proposal? Areas for spreading nuclear weapons-borne equipment will be limited. Subsequently a possible outbreak of a nuclear conflict will be really reduced. The creation of such a zone will become a strong political and moral stimulus for those who must still be convinced that nuclear weapons have no future. In addition, the ban on nuclear weapons in Southeast Asia will counter efforts by certain circles to ignite the militaristic fervor in this region and drag ASEAN into a military orbit. Finally, it must be definitely seen that the existence of nuclear weapons in the region and activities by those who are trying to maintain these weapons will be an obstacle to the normal development of the political and economic process in Southeast Asia. The removal of this obstacle will help enhance mutual trust and further develop a favorable climate for multifaceted cooperation, including in the economic field, among all the parties concerned. All ASEAN member countries are now expressing this desire.

Certainly, creating a nuclear-free zone is not an easy matter. As apparent in the Rarotonga Treaty, the attitude of nuclear countries toward antinuclear regional initiatives plays a very important role. The United States, Great Britain, and France have not yet joined the

treaty. However, this has in no way reduced its significance because the need for its own stand on this issue is a stimulus to accelerate a more realistic and constructive approach to security problems.

The Soviet Union welcomes antinuclear initiatives in the Asia-Pacific region because their presentation and materialization are a component indispensable for a move toward a nuclear-free world. Efforts to achieve the goals are given priority in the Soviet foreign policy. The Soviet Union also believes that certain current problems will only be resolved through a common sense of all the members of the international community through dialogue. In the meantime, the dialogue must be a dialogue between equal parties, and the equality of nations is impossible without the elimination of nuclear weapons. Because of this, the present antinuclear initiatives by the ASEAN countries are very important and timely.

Commentary Notes Improved Ties With Thailand
*BK061244 Moscow in Thai to Thailand 1100 GMT
5 Dec 87*

[Unattributed commentary marking Thailand's national day]

[Text] Dear listeners: Five December marks Thailand's national day. The Thai-language service of Radio Moscow wishes happiness and prosperity for all Thai listeners.

The Thai and Soviet people have one thing in common: They both desire peace. Despite existing differences, ties between the two countries are developing constantly. We have seen evidence during the past year of the fruits of bilateral ties. For the first time in the history of Soviet-Thai relations, the Thai foreign minister paid an official visit to the USSR. The Soviet Union held this visit as an important step in the development of contacts between the USSR and Thailand. The Thai foreign minister, His Excellency Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila, also felt that such contacts would create better understanding and favorable conditions helpful for development of bilateral relations in various fields. Certainly, such relations depend on several factors. Thailand itself considers the improvement in relations a result of the new direction in Soviet foreign policy.

Thailand gives special attention to various statements of the Soviet Union dealing with peace in Asia and the Pacific. Thai Foreign Minister Air Chief Marshal Sitthi Sawetsila said during his visit to Moscow that the people in the region welcome positive efforts made by the Soviet Union in playing a constructive and energetic role for development of friendly and fruitful relations among countries. In our present era of complexity, any move or proposal based on the desire to achieve international detente is worth study and support. ASEAN's policy to make Southeast Asia a nuclear-free zone is such a proposal.

We would like to point out that both the USSR and Thailand agreed during talks in Moscow on the importance of nuclear arms limitation and the demilitarization of outer space, and the political settlement of international disputes.

Concerning regional disputes, we would like to note that the hope to effectively settle the Cambodian problem only emerged recently. Ways and means to achieve a settlement of the problem emerged mainly as a result of the Cambodian Government's policy of national reconciliation. According to the policy, a concrete plan was adopted for practical implementation and has been implemented. To cite an example, the sixth partial withdrawal of Vietnamese Army volunteers from Cambodia has been carried out. The total withdrawal of Vietnamese troops will be completed by 1990; that means, together with an end to foreign interference in the internal affairs of Cambodia, and to utilization of foreign territories as a beachhead for resistance operations against Cambodia. According to a report by the newspaper THE NATION, Thai authorities noted that the troop withdrawal plan is a serious plan. In response, Thai military authorities have ordered the withdrawal of a major portion of Thai soldiers from the Thai-Cambodian border. Observers noted that such a move will considerably contribute to the relaxation of tension along the Thai-Cambodian border. The Thai-Cambodian border situation has spoiled the political atmosphere in the region for a long time.

Additionally, a positive trend in the settlement of the Cambodian problem is the result of talks held regularly between the Cambodian Government and the various Cambodian resistance factions. This includes the just ended meeting in France between Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, leader of a Cambodian resistance faction. News agencies reporting on the meeting described it as open-minded, straightforward, and friendly. Prime Minister Hun Sen himself noted that the talks helped in following up problems in the conflict. Both sides agreed to continue contacts and hold future meetings. Such a bright political atmosphere and favorable development in efforts to settle regional disputes contribute to the development of international relations. Such an internal trend would become more realistic and beneficial if only concerned parties adopt a closer or similar attitude concerning major problems, and if those countries have long-established relations based on fine traditions.

We can conclude from the above-mentioned statement that chances and opportunities to develop Soviet-Thai relations are far from fully utilized. Nevertheless, we can always hope that our contacts and relations will develop further in keeping with the wishes, appeals, and calls motivated by the complexity of our present era and based on the interests of Soviet and Thai people.

PRK's Hun Sen Reports on Talks With Sihanouk
LD141316 Moscow TASS in English 1052 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Phnom Penh December 14 TASS—The meeting of Hun Sen, member of the Political Bureau of the People's Revolutionary Party of Kampuchea (PRPK) Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Kampuchea, with Prince Norodom Sihanouk in France has become an event of historic importance, which relieved the situation around Kampuchea, the Political Bureau of the PRPK Central Committee said at its meeting here.

The Politbureau heard Hun Sen's report on the results of his talks with Sihanouk, a leader of the opposition emigrant forces, and assessed them as a step forward in the direction of a political solution in line with the national reconciliation policy and the Kampuchean people's hopes, SPK news agency reports.

On Saturday, SPK released Hun Sen's message to the Kampuchean people informing them that he had received a telegram from Sihanouk recently, from which it followed that the prince would attend two new meetings with Hun Sen, the agreement on which was reached in France, only on condition that two other opposition groups of Khmers—the Pol Pot men led by Khieu Samphan and the so-called National Front for the Liberation of the Khmer People led by Son Sann—joined the talks. "We understand well the motives of this decision", Hun Sen's message says.

Kampuchea accepts the idea of both bilateral and multilateral talks, if they are aimed at the quest for a reasonable settlement of the Kampuchean problem, the message points out. If the two other parties refuse to sit down at the negotiating table, thus creating obstacles on the way to the quest for a political solution, we will not be able to wait and allow the settlement of the formed situation to be delayed.

Having informed his fellow citizens on the talks with Prince Sihanouk, Hun Sen emphasized that this first meeting between the members of the opposing Khmer forces was of historic significance. He called upon all Kampucheans to make their contribution to the national reconciliation process.

UN Committee Working on Micronesia Report
LD150852 Moscow TASS in English 0824 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 15 TASS—The 54th session of the U.N. Trusteeship Council resumed its work Monday. It is to approve a report to the U.N. Security Council on the situation in the Trust Territory of Pacific Islands (Micronesia) temporarily administered by the United States.

Representatives of public organizations who addressed the session called attention to the fact that the illegal actions taken by Washington against Micronesia, specifically, the imposing upon the component parts of the archipelago of the status of "free association" with the U.S. constituted an impermissible violation of the U.N. Charter, the declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples and of the principles of law and order. This is stated as well in appeals of 70 petitioners received by the Trusteeship Council these days.

The U.N. is following with concern the manoeuvring of the administering member country which is trying to secure for itself the right to decide the destiny of the Micronesian people by-passing the U.N. Security Council. A recent session of the Subcommittee for Small Territories of the U.N. Decolonization Committee approved a report that demanded the granting to the Micronesian people of an opportunity to exercise their right to self-determination. The subcommittee demanded as well that the U.S. refrain from any actions hampering the preservation of unity of the Pacific Islands or the exercise of the rights of Micronesians. The report specially pointed out that any changes of the status of Micronesia could be made by the U.N. Security Council and it alone.

VNA, Soviet Press Agencies Cooperation Viewed
BK051625 Moscow International Service
in Vietnamese 1000 GMT 3 Dec 87

["Recent" interview with Dao Tung, VNA director general, by station correspondent Aleksey Lensov in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Aleksey Lensov] How has cooperation between the Soviet news agencies and VNA developed?

[Dao Tung] I am very happy to review the cooperation over past decades between VNA and the Soviet news agencies, including TASS and NOVOSTI, which has enabled VNA to develop. Back in the 1950's, TASS sent engineers and equipment to help us set up a teletype communications network; from this step of development, we have reached today's progress.

[Aleksey Lensov] What is the current level of cooperation between the news agencies of our two countries?

[Dao Tung] In the 1980's, we began cooperating with TASS in the electronics field. At present, we have set up an electronic communications link between Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City that operates at a speed of 600-1,200 bits per second. This is possible thanks to cooperation with the Soviet Union and TASS, as well as with CTK, ADN, and MTI.

[Aleksey Lensov] What are the programs of cooperation for the coming years?

[Dao Tung] In 1988, we will finish setting up an electronic link between Hanoi and Moscow, specifically between VNA and TASS. If things go well, this link will operate at a high speed—9,600 bits per second. Photos will also be transmitted by digital methods, and news will be transmitted at a speed of 300 or more bits per second. This is a very big goal of cooperation. Therefore, it can be said that our cooperation with TASS will be special in 1988, when this electronic link is completed. Through this link, both TASS offices in Hanoi and Ho Chi Minh City will be able to communicate directly with their home office in Moscow via a 300-bit per second electronic channel.

[Aleksey Lensov] Comrade, you have just talked about your relations with TASS, but what are the prospects for cooperation with NOVOSTI?

[Dao Tung] We have another very big cooperation project with NOVOSTI. Our news agency has been entrusted by the Secretariat with the task of translating and printing the MOSCOW NEWS in Vietnamese. Yesterday, we worked with Comrade Yakovlev, editor-in-chief of MOSCOW NEWS, on this big cooperation project. I also want to take this opportunity to say that next year we will effect all-around cooperation between the Vietnamese Journalists' Association and its Soviet counterpart. Therefore, we think that this year, the very 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, marks a new step of development in cooperation between the Vietnamese and Soviet mass media.

Briefs

Soviet TV to Australia

Starting next January Australians will be able to watch Soviet television sitting in their armchairs. On 1 January Soviet national television is to begin broadcasting to Australia. An agreement to that effect has been signed by the Soviet television and radio broadcasting committee, Gosteleradio, and the Australian (?Curly) Company. [Excerpt] [*Moscow World Service in English* 0110 GMT 12 Dec 87 LD]

Near East & South Asia

DRA's Najibullah Welcomes Signing of INF Treaty
LD130038 Moscow TASS in English 1737 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Kabul December 12 TASS—Afghan President Najibullah has welcomed the signing of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Eliminating Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles as a historic event of tremendous significance to all nations, including the Afghan people.

In a television appearance he said it had demonstrated that even amid tension practical steps could be taken in matters of life and death for humanity.

Najibullah added it was gratifying that in spite of the difficulties, the policy of peace was gaining ground.

"Our people, who have experienced the hardships of war for nine years, know the price of peace well. They hail any step that will facilitate a settlement of the situation concerning Afghanistan and the national reconciliation policy," the Afghan president declared.

400 Afghans Return Home; 600 Lay Down Arms
LD150934 Moscow TASS in English 0854 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Kabul December 15 TASS—TASS correspondent Oleg Kuzmin reports:

Four hundred Afghans, who left the country by virtue of various circumstances, have returned to the homeland in the last week. The local authorities helped the fellow citizens in providing them with housing and jobs. Under the influence of the decisions passed by Loya Jirgah, 600 members of armed groups went over to the side of the people's government.

Six hundred and sixty five people were released in the last seven days. They were pardoned by the presidential decree.

An operation to rout a gang which terrorized the local population was carried out in Imamsahib District at the request of the residents of several villages. The gang of extremists was crushed. Afghan soldiers seized a large number of weapons of foreign manufacture, including grenade launchers and mounted machine guns.

Soviet View of Iran's Stand on DRA Noted
NC131141 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1630 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Unattributed commentary]

[Excerpts] Tehran expresses solidarity with the view that after the withdrawal of Soviet military units from Afghanistan there should be no foreign intervention in Afghanistan's domestic affairs. Meanwhile, this view is presented as the Soviet Union's view.

Of course the Soviet Union is not opposed to support from the Iranian leaders in its efforts to arrive at a political solution of problems around Afghanistan, but Iran should at least have a correct picture of the Soviet stand, which is that foreign intervention in Afghan affairs should end not only after the withdrawal of the Soviet units but at once.

Moscow considers any fabrication or allegation that the reason for foreign intervention in Afghanistan's affairs is the presence of Soviet military units in that country to be spiteful, and rejects such allegations. Who is unaware that the machinations by imperialism and regional reaction against Afghanistan from abroad began in the very

first days after the victory of the April revolution? These machinations continued for almost 20 months, until the time when the Soviet Union extended assistance to the Afghans to thwart aggression from outside. Obviously, with the cessation of foreign intervention, the presence of Soviet military forces in Afghanistan will also end.

It should not be forgotten that from the very beginning the revolutionary regime had to solve complicated domestic problems. It also made mistakes, and the regime's leaders have admitted this. The policy of national reconciliation that is now being implemented by Afghanistan was introduced to reform the situation, ensure peace, achieve national agreement, and allow the free activity of political parties in the country. The need for the necessary political and economic guarantees to achieve these ends is increasing. Efforts to thwart this process and the encouragement of political fanaticism will not result in victory for those who initiate them.

The enemies of reconstructed Afghanistan are trying to exploit the recently approved UN General Assembly resolution on Afghanistan for their own unclean ends. This resolution ignores the principle of non-intervention by all foreign governments in Afghanistan's affairs. They see this resolution as support for the extremists who give themselves the right to speak on behalf of the Afghan nation. However, this is either self-deception or an attempt to (?deceive others). Democratic Afghanistan continues to strengthen its positions on the international level and it is expanding its diplomatic relations. [passage omitted]

In view of such realities, the approval of an unorthodox resolution on Afghanistan in the United Nations does not, in any way, represent world support for the counterrevolutionaries. As pointed out by Afghan Foreign Minister Abdul Wakil in a BIA interview: A resolution that has been approved by imperialist governments and their minions amidst a propaganda commotion and on the basis of distorted reports does not represent the political stand of UN members on the Afghan regime. Most of these members support Afghanistan's foreign policy and its policy of national reconciliation, which is creating a good basis for a political solution of the problems around Afghanistan; and all those who sincerely want tensions in the Middle East to end should not ignore this policy.

Afghanistan's neighbors, especially Iran, can play a noteworthy part in solving this problem. However, in order to do so Iran should close its borders to the extremist groups that seek to infiltrate and spread the seeds of death and destruction in Afghanistan, and open these borders to those Afghans who want to return to their homeland from Iran and lead a peace-seeking and constructive life.

Factors Favoring, Impeding Near East Parley
PM141707 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Second Edition p 5

[Vladimir Peresada "Commentator's Column": "To Convene the Conference"]

[Text] The UN General Assembly passed two resolutions on the Near East. The essence of the recommendations contained in them is as follows. An all-embracing and fair settlement in the region requires the convening of an international conference attended by the five permanent members of the Security Council and all parties to the Arab-Israeli conflict, including the PLO. The basis of the collective efforts for a settlement must be provided by the full implementation of the Palestinian people's national rights and the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Israeli troops from all occupied Arab territories.

Agreement by the overwhelming majority of the world community underlies this approach. Over the years, the long-standing Soviet initiative on convening the conference has gained very broad support, and this is no accident. On the one hand there has been growing awareness in dozens of states, including Western states, that any settlement in the Near East cannot be a fair, and therefore lasting settlement, without satisfying the legitimate national rights of Palestinians who have been deprived of a homeland as a result of Israeli aggressions. On the other hand it has been realized that separate deals, as the experience of the Camp David agreements showed, do not lead to such a settlement.

What is preventing the immediate, broad launching of preparations for the forum, what is preventing the start of the negotiating process, what is preventing this process including the existing bilateral and multilateral contacts? The "braking factor" remains, as always, the stance of Israel and the United States. This was proved again during the UN discussion of the resolutions on the Near East. The representatives of Tel Aviv and Washington voted against them.

Of course, it has to be noted that voices in favor of the conference have also been heard recently both in Israel and in the United States, and at a sufficiently high and responsible level, at that. Israel's Foreign Minister Peres and his entourage, and several Washington administration officials have spoken in favor of convening it. However, a certain clarification is needed here. The champions of the idea of holding the forum in Tel Aviv and across the ocean attach "their own" meaning to it. Judging by the statements that have been published, they would like to see the conference only as an "umbrella" to cover up new separate deals at the Palestinians' expense—in other words, the very same Camp David-style policy—they oppose the PLO's participation in the conference, and they are unwilling to even hear any mention of the solution of the key aspect of the Palestinian and entire Near East problem—the creation of an independent Palestinian state.

Of course, the Soviet Union is prepared to participate in a conference whose purpose would be a genuine settlement in the region. Such a settlement is possible only by

taking into account the interests of all sides affected by an Arab-Israeli conflict which has lasted for several decades now. Including, unreservedly, the Palestinian people's interests.

U.S.-Israeli Position Blocks Mideast Conference
*LD141845 Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT
14 Dec 87*

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—By TASS Political News Analyst Boris Shabayev:

The situation taking shape around the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East strikes one as paradoxical. An overwhelming majority of states view such a conference to be held with the participation of the five permanent U.N. Security Council members and all sides involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict, including PLO, to be the sole realistic way to ensuring a comprehensive and just Middle East settlement. A fresh convincing proof of that are the results of voting on the resolution to this effect at the current U.N. General Assembly session. Yet no progress has been so far made: things have not gone farther than statements on the need for the convocation of this forum.

What is the obstacle in the way of starting practical preparations for it, wherein is the drag on the implementation of such an important and urgent task? The main obstacle, they in the Arab countries say in answer to this question is the stand of the USA and Israel. Speaking in an interview with the Cairo newspaper AL-AHRAM, Jordanian King Husayn stressed that in persistently rejecting the idea of holding an international conference, the United States actually reflects the interests of Israel's right-wing extremist forces.

The Israeli hawks do not even take the trouble of concealing these interests, which are: the perpetuation of the occupation of the Arab lands, prevention of a just settlement of the Palestinian problem, which is the pivotal issue of Middle East settlement, on the sole possible basis of recognition of the inalienable national rights of the Palestinian people. These circles are encouraged by Washington, in an attempt to make the Arabs agree to participation in a "conference" that would, as a matter of fact, legalise the Israeli territorial seizures.

It is from this viewpoint—the military—diplomatic pressure on the Arabs—that one shall view the reports on a fresh massing of Israeli troops along the Lebanese border, the impending signing between Washington and Tel Aviv of a new defence treaty, which as the REUTERS agency said, will give Israel the same status in military cooperation with the USA as to the NATO allies.

Yet it will be an oversimplification to believe that the only drag on the international conference on the Middle East is the stand of the USA and Israel. One cannot but agree with the Arab leaders, who in common with King Husayn in the above-mentioned interview, stress the

need for strengthening inter-Arab solidarity, the unity of Arab ranks as an important factor contributing to a peaceful settlement of that region's painful problems. Since those who oppose lasting peace in the Middle East bank precisely on lack of such unity.

Hence it follows that the stand on the question of holding an international conference on the Middle East is a touchstone of the attitude to the settlement of the Middle East conflict, which has for 40 years now been the cause of incalculable calamities for the peoples of that region.

USSR Presidium, UAE President Exchange Cables
*PM141415 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87
Morning Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has sent Zayid ibn Sultan Shaykh al-Nuhayyan, president of the United Arab Emirates (UAE), a congratulatory telegram on the UAE's National Day. We are confident, the telegram said, that good relations between our countries, which are based on the principles of equality, mutual respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs, will develop successfully in the interests of universal peace and international cooperation.

In an answering telegram Zayid ibn Sultan Shaykh al-Nuhayyan expressed his gratitude for the congratulations and wished the Soviet people further progress and prosperity.

The telegram voices the hope that friendly relations and cooperation between the USSR and the UAE will continue to develop and grow stronger for the good of both countries' peoples.

USSR Presidium Sends Thanks to Omani Sultan
*JN121315 Muscat Domestic Service in Arabic
1100 GMT 12 Dec 87*

["Text of cable to Sultan Qabus ibn Sa'id of Oman from USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium replying to his congratulatory cable on the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution—date not given]

[Text] His Majesty Sultan Qabus ibn Sa'id of Oman, Muscat. Your Majesty, please accept our thanks for the heartfelt congratulations and the good wishes on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution [GOSR]. We wish you good health and happiness, and the Omani people success.

Processes in Post-Bourguiba Tunisia Examined
PM141503 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 87
Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Neznamov report: "Tunisia: After the Change of Guard"]

[Text] Tunis—More than a month has passed since the career of Habib Bourguiba—one of the most well-known African leaders, with whose name Tunisian independence, the process of the Tunisian Republic's formation, its successes, and its current painful and complicated problems are linked—came to an end. Old and ill as he was, a special conference of doctors reached the conclusion that the country's first president could no longer fulfill the functions incumbent upon him, and so he was removed as head of state in accordance with constitutional law. The Tunisian presidential duties have been assumed by Zine El Abidine Ben Ali, the 51-year-old prime minister and minister of the interior. The new government formed 7 November is led by the 57-year-old Hedi Baccouche, an influential figure in the ruling Destourian Socialist Party (PSD). The change of leadership went smoothly and is seen by the majority of the population as the logical solution to the situation.

"The deposition of H. Bourguiba," M. Masmoudi, director of the newspaper L'ACTION, said in a conversation with your correspondent, "has created a new atmosphere in our society. The Tunisian people are beginning to lose their fear for the future and the painful uncertainty caused by a situation where authority depended totally on the whim of one old man and his closest associates."

I heard this opinion expressed by many people living in the capital—journalists and political figures, passersby, and habitués of cafés. It arose on the wave of the first political statements by the new president and the new government decisions. What are the most important aspects?

"The PSD is the ruling party and naturally intends to retain power in the future," party director H. Karoui emphasized. He was appointed several months ago to the post of director, which makes him third in order of seniority in the party. Karoui is a veteran of the Destourian movement, which he has been with since his student years.

"We do not want to remain in power simply to hold onto the leading posts in the country but to implement party policy, which we believe to be in Tunisia's best interests," he said. This can only be achieved by democratizing internal party life and Tunisian society as a whole and galvanizing the party and all its structures. Our main task is to regain the people's confidence."

In his first days as president of the country, Ben Ali met with many influential PSD members—past prime ministers and ministers—and secured their support. The

new authorities are not preventing the return home of party members who originally left Tunisia to escape prosecution or because of their opposition to H. Bourguiba's policies.

The Tunisian leaders' attempts at dialogue to strengthen political stability are not limited to the ruling party and the groups incorporated in it. PSD Director H. Karoui frankly indicated the interest felt by the party and President Ben Ali personally in restoring "real principles of an interparty system" in Tunisia.

How is this approach materializing in social life? The restrictions on "legal opposition" activity which existed prior to 7 November have now been lifted. The newspapers of the Communist Party and the Movement of Social Democrats are on sale in kiosks alongside government publications. The new rubrics "Free Platform" and "The Life of the Parties" have appeared on the pages of the official press.

It should be pointed out that legal Tunisian opposition in the form of the Communist Party, the Movement of Social Democrats, and the Popular Unity Movement is satisfied with the trend toward developing democratic institutions announced in Ben Ali's political declaration.

"The Tunisian Communist Party is prepared to develop a dialogue with the authorities," M. Harmel, secretary general of the party, said. "There is a common platform for this dialogue: the president's declaration, which must be given real substance in practice."

Three national commissions which have been instructed to draw up a number of important draft bills and submit them for discussion by parliament began work 13 November. Observers agree that articles enshrining lifelong presidency and automatic inheritance of the presidency by the prime minister will be removed from the Constitution. Laws governing a multiparty system and the press are being drawn up in parallel.

There is a difficult relationship between the authorities and Muslim circles, some of whom have advocated and continue to advocate extremist methods of struggle to transform the secular state into an Islamic republic. The fact that the Supreme Court has issued tough sentences to the extremists arrested in September this year shows that the new Tunisian leadership has no intention of making concessions to those who use religion for political ends and take up arms.

The new Tunisian leadership regards economic and social transformations "in the people's interests" as its prime task. In the economic sphere this involves measures to ensure self-sufficiency in food, the development of exports, the creation of new jobs, particularly for young people, and expansion of capital investments.

On a social level there are plans to draw up new draft regulations governing health insurance for employees in the state and public sectors and also measures affecting housing construction, as well as plans to increase wages for some categories of working people.

The long-awaited reforms planned by the government will not change the direction of Tunisia's socioeconomic development. If profitability, efficiency, and competitiveness are becoming the slogans of the day, the course chosen to develop the national economy is based, according to LA PRESSE DE TUNISIE, on the principle of "greater initiative by private capital and less interference by the state."

...Continuity and renewal. These two words possibly define the development of the political situation in Tunisia since 7 November. A lot of promises have been made, which have given rise to fresh hope.

Libya Resolutely Denies Planning To Attack Chad
LD141618 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Tripoli December 14 TASS—The Bureau of the General People's Committee for Foreign Liaison of the Libyan Jamahiriyyah rejected allegations that Libyan troops are readied to attack Chad and that there have been already several hundred violations of Chadian air space. The Bureau's statement circulated by JANA news agency says that such allegations are aimed at justifying the interference of the United States and France in the affairs of that African country.

Condemning overt imperialist interference, the statement says that the truth is that those who fight in the east of Chad and in other Chadian areas are not Libyans.

France asserts that it supports the efforts of the Organization of African Unity for a peaceful settlement to the Chadian-Libyan conflict, the document says. How can the support for peaceful efforts of the Organization of African Unity go together with statements about the resumption of arms supplies to Ndjamenah? "We ask again when this aid will stop. At the same time we resolutely reject the allegations about Libya's preparing an aggression against Chad and its violation of Chadian air space. Libya holds that these allegations are aimed at justifying a new aggression against Libya which is prepared with open interference of France and the United States. As to the Libyan Jamahiriyyah it believes in the efforts of the Organization of African Unity, proclaims adherence to its decisions and will spare no efforts to support them", the statement says.

East Europe

Minister Yazov Visits USSR Troops in GDR
PM141639 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian
13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "More Businesslike Efficiency, Organization"]

[Text] Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, has visited a number of units in the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany. He met with personnel and talked with officers, ensigns, sergeants, soldiers, and members of servicemen's families. The results of the recently ended Soviet-U.S. summit talks were at the center of attention during these talks.

Army Gen D.T. Yazov showed interest in questions of the practical realization of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and the guidelines expressed in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues." It was pointed out that crucial tasks face commanders, political organs, party organizations, and all military cadres in connection with the preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference. The chief thing today is daily, persistent, purposeful work to implement what is planned and the selfless, enterprising fulfillment of everyone's duty and obligations. The progress in preparing for the new training year, the year of the Soviet Armed Forces' 70th anniversary, was analyzed from this viewpoint. It must be marked by selfless military labor, improved combat readiness, and increased combat skill in the name of ensuring the reliable defense of October's gains and of the state interests of the USSR and all the socialist community countries. It was emphasized that Soviet servicemen are fulfilling their patriotic and international duty in single combat formation with the personnel of the armies of the other Warsaw Pact countries.

Great attention was devoted to enhancing the effectiveness of the organizational and educational work of commanders, political organs, staffs, and party and Komsomol organizations in strengthening military discipline, rallying multinational military collectives, and unswervingly fulfilling the regulations' requirements. Here special emphasis was placed on ensuring every officer's exemplariness and improving individual training.

The defense minister was also showed interest in problems of the personnel's material, domestic, and cultural services. He visited several subunits, a soldiers' mess room, and an officers' hostel.

Army Gen B.V. Snetkov, commander in chief of the Group of Soviet Forces in Germany, and Colonel General N.A. Moiseyev, member of the Military Council and chief of the Group Political Directorate, participated in the meetings with servicemen.

SFRY President Cables Gorbachev, Reagan
PM141515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87
Second Edition p 3

[Own correspondents 10 December reports under general headline "A Historic Event. The Planet Welcomes the Signing of the Soviet-American Treaty on the Elimination of Two Classes of Nuclear Missiles"]

[Text] Belgrade [subhead]

L. Mojsov, president of the SFRY Presidium, has sent a greetings message to M. Gorbachev and R. Reagan. After long and complex negotiations, the message says, thanks to your personal efforts, a decision on measures to eliminate a whole class of nuclear arms has been adopted for the first time. This is the best possible proof that disarmament and the improvement of international relations is not only necessary but also possible. We are convinced that treaty is a historic event both as regards its importance and its prospects. It opens a new stage in the talks on the most important problems confronting the world among which, in addition to disarmament, a key place is occupied also by problems of development.

Trade Protocol With Poland Signed

PM141617 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 87
Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Protocol Signed"]

[Text] An intergovernmental protocol on goods turnover between the USSR and Poland for 1988 has been signed in Moscow. The protocol makes provision for the further expansion of reciprocal deliveries of modern metal-cutting, forging, and pressing equipment, geological prospecting and mining equipment, communications and computer equipment, motor vehicle goods, and road-building, tractor, and agricultural machinery.

Reciprocal deliveries of consumer goods will also be further developed.

Kharchenko-Led CPSU Delegation Visits Poland

PM141647 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for CPSU-PZPR ties, a delegation of CPSU party officials headed by G.P. Kharchenko, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, was in Poland 7-12 December and studied the experience of work by PZPR party organizations on the development of the trade union movement in Poland.

The delegation was received by M. Wozniak, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee.

Prague Ceremony Launches Gorbachev Book in CSSR

PM141651 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
13 Dec 87 p 3

[TASS report: "Ceremonies To Launch the Soviet Leader's Book"]

[Text] Prague, 11 Dec—A ceremony took place here today to launch the book by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, "Restructuring and the New Thinking for Our Country and the

Whole World," which has been published in a mass edition in Czech and in Slovak at the "Freedom" and "Truth" Publishing Houses respectively. J. Fojtik, candidate member of the Presidium and secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, and representatives of the Czechoslovak capital's public attended the ceremony.

Addressing the meeting, Fojtik stressed that in a short period M.S. Gorbachev's book has received a tremendous response throughout the entire world. It has come out in Czechoslovakia at a time when Communists and all Czechoslovak society are occupied in implementing the decisions of the 17th CPCZ Congress, designed to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development, restructure the economic mechanism, and deepen socialist democracy. The experience of Soviet Communists is invaluable for us in this work. The documents of the historic 27th CPSU Congress and subsequent CPSU Central Committee plenums and now also the book by the CPSU Central Committee general secretary, which gives a concentrated account of the strategy and tactics of restructuring, are of great international importance.

Romania's Vaduva Holds Talks With Aristov

AU121405 Bucharest AGERPRES in English
1239 GMT 12 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow, AGERPRES 12/12/1987—During their talks in Moscow, Ilie Vaduva, minister of foreign trade and international economic cooperation, and Boris Aristov, minister of foreign trade of the USSR, analyzed problems of development of the Romanian-Soviet goods exchanges and economic cooperation in keeping with the summit understandings.

The two ministers signed the protocol on goods exchanges between Romania and the USSR for 1988, that stipulates the further development of the economic collaboration between the two countries.

RCP Executive Committee Examines Economics

PM141631 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Political Executive Committee Session"]

[Text] Bucharest, 12 Dec—A session of the RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee has been held here. Its participants examined the progress to date and the tasks for ensuring complete fulfillment of plan targets for December and for 1987 as a whole.

During the session, RCP General Secretary N. Ceausescu submitted a proposal according to which, starting this year, 50% of the enterprise profit participation fund will be paid out to working people before the end of the year and the remaining 50% early in the following year, after overall results have been summed up. The Central Committee Political Executive Committee unanimously approved this proposal.

The RCP Central Committee Political Executive Committee examined the progress in preparations for the RCP national conference and adopted a relevant resolution on this question.

West Europe

French Minister's Criticism of INF Treaty Hit *PM150909 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5*

[S. Mikheyev "Rejoinder": "Cave-Dwelling Futurism"]

[Text] There has been a favorable response to the Treaty on the Elimination of Medium- and Shorter-Range Missiles all over the world, but there are also some people whose reaction is completely different. French Minister of Culture and Communications F. Leotard, for example, believes that this document is "useless and even harmful for Europe's security." Expounding his viewpoint in the newspaper LE FIGARO, Leotard attempted to convince his compatriots that "the Soviet nuclear threat hanging over Europe remains virtually undiminished."

It is, of course, good when a civilian minister is also versed in the finer points of military strategy. But the situation appears somewhat of a paradox to us: Someone who should be concerned with the flourishing and development of his country's culture is doing the exact opposite. We do not know what the minister of culture prefers—contemporary art or cave paintings—but he does not leave any choice to his compatriots. After all, in all likelihood, only cave paintings will remain in the event of a nuclear catastrophe. And, in fact, there will not even be anyone left to visit these caves!

Talks on U.S. Presence in Spain 'May Be Put Off' *LD151134 Moscow TASS in English 1100 GMT 15 Dec 87*

[Text] Paris December 15 TASS—Another round of talks between the United States and Spain on reducing U.S. military presence in the latter country, slated to open on December 18, may be put off, AGENCE FRANCE PRESSE reported.

Quoting what it said were reliable sources, it added that it might be postponed at least till January since the sides had failed to do anything towards narrowing the differences in their positions lately.

The Spanish Government demands that 72 U.S. nuclear-capable fighter-bombers based not far from Madrid be removed from the country and the number of U.S. personnel on station there be slashed.

Washington, however, is out to preserve the size of its military presence in the Pyrenees. The previous round of the talks ended without any meaningful results.

There is also another reason why the next round may be postponed. With tensions building up in bilateral relations, the Spanish Government announced on November 9 it was not going automatically to renew the existing agreement of friendship, defense and cooperation.

The issue of American military presence in Spain, the local press says, will now have to be resolved as part of a revision of the entire package of bilateral relations.

DPA's 'Sensational' Journalism Criticized *PM151023 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87 First Edition p 5*

[Viktor Ponomarev report: "Red-Handed! Career Based on Lies"]

[Text] Glasnost, open discussion, and the freedom to express opinions are, indisputably, the most striking manifestation of the spirit of our times. But there are also many people who have, as they say, grown sick and tired of both the glasnost and the truth they find in argument.

Of course, if our way of thinking and way of life evoke a pathological hatred in a particular person, that cannot be helped. Love cannot be compelled. It is a different matter when this person has the opportunity of foisting his opinion on millions, as West German DPA correspondent Hartwig Nate can.

The first and the strongest impression you get from Nate's writing is that this man is absorbed in the trivialities of our daily life, which he hates, and that his hatred is so strong that he can write about nothing else. But let us not make hasty conclusions; let us become more closely acquainted with his work.

In September, DPA published Nate's commentaries on the Moscow proceedings against Rust, the FRG amateur pilot. He sees through all our "ruses." Nate asks why the Soviet mass media covered the trial in such detail and so openly. Moreover, the most favorable conditions had been created for foreign journalists to work. Something is not quite right here.

The natural explanation is plain to see: In the atmosphere of restructuring, glasnost, and democratization of public life under way in our country, the coverage could not be otherwise. This explanation has not entered the head of the chief of the DPA office. It turns out that such a "comparatively light sentence by Soviet standards" was designed to mislead the Western public. But Hartwig Nate also does not mention the fact that the judge listened attentively to the arguments of Rust's defense attorney, nor the fact that he halved his term of imprisonment despite the prosecutor's demands. It seems that neither the trial nor even Rust himself were of interest to the DPA correspondent.

As a matter of fact, Nate's labored suspiciousness is the logical continuation of the story which began when the world's news agency teleprinters reported the sporting aircraft's flight from Hamburg and our country's severe assessment of the air defense command's negligence. It was obligated to terminate the flight by the intruder aircraft without resorting to combat means. The report on the session of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo said this unequivocally. Foreign mass media stressed this particularly, noting the humanitarian approach, which is in full accord with Soviet foreign policy.

In a sensational commentary, the head of DPA's Moscow mission asserted without a twinge of conscience that the air defense leadership had been punished "for not employing combat means against the sporting aircraft." Moreover, to add greater conviction, he cited TASS, which did not report anything of the sort. A mistake in translation maybe? Or a communications malfunction? Neither.

That evening we could not get through to the author of the "sensation." Yet next morning, quite a different report came in from Hamburg on DPA channels—a precise verbatim text on the Politburo session taken from the GDR press. Thus, by repudiating the report from its Moscow desk, the agency extricated itself from the scandalous situation which Hartwig Nate had once again gotten it into.

Why "once again?" Last May, a "nightmarish" item of news flew around the world that a woman and her young children in Gomel were going bald as a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

Soon, however, it emerged that no tragically suffering mother had called him in Moscow from Gomel. Because other correspondents' attempts to track her down clearly showed that there is no such woman either in Gomel or its environs. A certain exalted "Moscow madam" had whispered a malicious piece of gossip in the chief correspondent's ear. Presumably this was the same woman he had strenuously publicized in February after the Zionists' provocative "show" in the Arbat on the eve of the Moscow forum of peaceloving forces.

Let us add another small detail to the portrait. In February, on the day of the provocative Zionist demonstration in the Arbat, he turned up at militia headquarters. An unknown—as the militia records have written—insolent boor went for a militiaman who was responsible for keeping order. It was only later, evidently, when a frightened Mr Nate began to swear that "he had accidentally collided with" the militiaman. But in order to rehabilitate himself with his own bosses, he immediately wrote an "essay" on the supposedly terrible conditions in which foreign correspondents have to work in Moscow. Moreover, he wrote it as a commentary on a

PRAVDA article on U.S. State Department discriminatory measures against Soviet journalists in Washington. "Escorted to the Press Department" was the title of the article.

He wrote about press conferences in Moscow at which—allegedly—"Western journalists do not ask critical questions for fear of repression." Since I have attended them fairly regularly, I can assure you that I have not noticed such shyness, on Mr Nate's part included.

The reader has probably long been asking the question: How can a foreign correspondent for a respectable agency which values its reputation as an authentic source of information be such an utter dummy? Prior to his arrival in Moscow, Nate was a DPA stringer in the West Germany's Ruhr region, where his activity was confined entirely to the scandal column. His posting to the USSR unexpectedly plunged him headlong into big politics. He sensed his chance and immediately took up the slogan of the Jesuits: "The end justifies the means."

Three years ago, a change of leadership took place in DPA's Moscow office. Following a flurry of activity, Nate became the chief of the mission. There and then he also resolved to assert himself to the full. He needed "to win his spurs" and secure the reputation of a "a venerable Sovietologist" in order to clamber even higher.

However, glasnost is not only for those who write. Surely the reading public has the right to ask Mr Nate what he means by reporting that now that they have begun restructuring "the Soviets are practicing brinkmanship"? There is a very familiar ring to his claims that discontent will grow among the workers and employees, whom restructuring is allegedly "depriving of the great advantage which they have up to now enjoyed over the West, namely being able to work in a slipshod manner." According to his prognoses, unemployment will now overwhelm us too....

All this could have remained the "particular opinion" of the head of the DPA office, if new recipes had not been published for the CIA's old propaganda kitchen, Munich's Radio Liberty. The U.S. proprietors, as it emerged, do not advise a frontal offensive on restructuring. They have a different recipe—"egg on and brake." This means on the one hand asserting its "limited" and "inconsistent" character, and on the other fueling passions in those who do not favor restructuring: the bureaucrats, bribe takers, those who like to live at someone else's expense, the idlers and the loafers, and those who would systematically undermine the foundations of socialism in the USSR under the slogan of restructuring.

Both these aspects, however strange this may seem, can be seen in DPA commentaries from Moscow.

I have no doubt now that a third piece of advice given to stringers and staff "fighters" against restructuring is being acted on. As soon as any one of them is proved guilty of forgery, unscrupulousness, or violating journalistic ethics, they will immediately shout to the whole world about "pressure" on foreign correspondents and about obstacles keeping them from implementing their "professional duties." But really we only have one duty—to write the truth! The exposure of falsifiers is also glasnost.

And Mr Nate cries in vain that, after the publication of his sensation about Gorn's "balding inhabitants," many Soviet officials began to avoid meetings with the head of the DPA mission. He thinks nothing of distorting any statement.

I am by no means thinking of making any recommendations to the DPA leadership. But I am sure that the public of the FRG, a country which has a high level of relations with the USSR, deserves a more complete and more objective flow of information about the serious changes underway in Soviet society.

Economic Minister Bangemann Departs Moscow
LD151259 Hamburg DPA in German 1027 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA/VWD)—The German-Soviet economic commission will meet for its next ordinary session in Moscow next May, according to informed sources in Moscow who spoke at the end of the visit by Federal Economic Minister Martin Bangemann. No details emerged about Bangemann's talks in the Soviet capital. [passage omitted]

Contrary to expectations, Bangemann did not attend the signing of a contract for a German-Soviet joint venture involving the Burda publishing house. He had already left for London.

Latin America & Caribbean

Chile's United Left Releases Communique
PY140300 Moscow in Spanish to Chile 2130 GMT
11 Dec 87

["Text" of communique "From the United Left (IU) to the Chilean People and All Democratic Forces"; signed by IU President Luis Fernando Luengo and Jose Sanfuentes; date and place not given—read by announcer]

[Text] Through his decision to hold a fraudulent plebiscite, Pinochet has clearly shown his intention to keep himself in power.

The 1980 Constitution, especially Article 8, all the political laws that have been implemented, the indiscriminate use of state funds, the interference of the Armed Forces and Carabineros in the nation's life,

and the huge demagogic campaign staged by the government have frustrated the will and sovereignty of the Chilean people and destroyed their hopes.

The [word indistinct] have established a regime of hunger, misery, and unemployment that has created conditions for excessive exploitation of the workers, huge profits for economic groups and transnational companies, the transfer of the national economy into foreign hands, the degradation of the best levels of society, the systematic violation of human rights, and acts of violence and terrorism against the people.

The current international economic crisis will further worsen the situation. However, in view of this situation, we have decided to fight, spontaneously and resolutely, to prevent the dictator's plans from being put into effect.

This is the duty of all democrats, and this is United Left's [IU] proposal: We advocate a pact that calls for the organization, unity, and strengthening of the people to generate mobilizations, social unrest, rebellion, and democratic upheaval. In this way, we will break with the current regime and its programs, put an end to dictatorship, and effectively open the path to democracy.

The experience achieved in the last few years and the university students' great victory have shown us that this is the path to follow. [University of Chile Rector] Federici's dismissal, the 7 October general strike, and the mass demonstration by the Civic Assembly confirm it.

To ensure this path toward a democratic victory, it is necessary to encourage the efforts of millions of Chileans in their struggle to obtain bread, jobs, fair salaries and pensions, welfare, and job security. We must guarantee their right to education and support the autonomy of the universities. We defend their right to possess their own land, to enjoy freedom of expression, and to enjoy the arts and culture. We thus support all rights and claims of the sectors affected by the dictatorship.

The people's rejection of the plebiscite and their attempt to hold free and democratic elections, to strengthen social organizations, to defend the people's sovereignty and strength through mobilizations and unity, to pursue agreements and unity among the people by holding Civic Assembly meetings at all levels of society, to intensify efforts to create community and regional organizations, and to stage mobilizations in support of local demands will encourage the establishment of democratic power by the people.

The people must organize to denounce violations of their rights and defend these rights in the face of the regime's repressive policies, which endlessly increase the number of death threats, tortures, detentions, raids, and missing Chileans.

All parties comprising the IU, except the MIR [Movement of the Revolutionary Left], encourage Chileans to register at the electoral courts. However, the current situation calls for a new type of political action. The people must be heard. We must learn from their clamor for a united struggle; we must learn from their wisdom expressed in their conviction that together we can win.

The exclusion of the left or some leftist parties automatically denies the democratic character of any institutional system. The IU reiterates that under the 1980 Constitution, the timetable it establishes, and the political laws it creates, moving toward democracy will be impossible. For this reason, the IU does not share the decision of the Christian Democratic Party to enroll as a political party, and it considers that decision a serious error. The IU takes the same view of the decision by several organizations that want to register a so-called Party for Democracy, which will supposedly serve as an instrument. This amounts to endorsing a law that denies pluralism and approves the banning and persecuting of ideas, as in the case of Clodomiro Almeyda. Furthermore, these decisions make unification of the opposition that much more difficult.

The IU reaffirms that it is possible to continue the struggle to defeat the dictatorship. To this end, the main objective is to jointly, firmly, and with a spirit of cooperation pursue a minimum number of goals, the attainment of which will foil Pinochet's plan to perpetuate himself in power. The IU is consequently making these proposals to the people and all democratic forces:

First, to carry forward together the mobilization and struggle for the demands of all sectors affected by the dictatorship, and to do so on the basis of the document on Chile's demands set forth by the Civic Assembly, the petitions made by the National Workers Command, the principles in defense of human rights, and the platforms containing each sector's demands.

Second, to struggle for free and democratic presidential elections, as well as for election of a congress with constituent powers and election of municipal officials. For the expression of the popular will to be valid and legitimate, there must be minimum guarantees as basic conditions for participating in elections: Article 8 of the 1980 Constitution and its complementary law, which sound the death knell for the civic rights of thousands of Chileans, must be revoked. That article and law violate 25 human rights consecrated by the

Universal Human Rights Declaration and stand as stumbling blocks for a truly democratic rule of law. There must also be the guarantee that full rights can be exercised by all political parties; that freedom of assembly, association, and information be granted; that the state of exceptional rule be ended; that exile be banished; that political prisoners be set free; that the CNI [National Intelligence Center] be dismantled; that state resources not be used for electoral purposes; and that the Armed Forces and forces of order keep out and stay neutral in the electoral process.

Electoral guarantees must also be granted, such as a vote that is cast freely and secretly by well-informed citizens; full rights to elect or be elected; democratic control over the registration process, voting, and vote counting; and true representation in the electoral body, so all citizens with the right to vote can exercise it. The absence of conditions to ensure free and democratic elections provides sufficient grounds for declaring electoral results fraudulent and illegitimate. Any attempt to subject the people to such a fraud by force does nothing but legitimize the people's right to mass civil disobedience.

Third, to reject the plebiscite to endorse Pinochet and to denounce the fraud that is in the making.

Fourth, to reach agreements and make commitments for the country's governability in the future, based on the defense and exercise of human rights and social justice.

The IU expresses its willingness to strike agreements laying the foundations and propositions for a broadly participative government of transition. Likewise, the IU reaffirms its willingness to work for those patriotic and democratic objectives through a single opposition front that can be put together by negotiations.

The people will not be deceived by Pinochet's attempts to keep himself in power. They shall make their will prevail by resolutely improving popular organization and mustering popular forces for a civil disobedience and ungovernability movement that will ultimately put an end to the tyranny.

Panamanian Envoy on U.S. Plans 'To Kill' Noriega
LD151206 Moscow TASS in English 1150 GMT
15 Dec 87

[Text] San Jose December 15 TASS—U.S. secret services have devised a plan to kill General Manuel Antonio Noriega, commander-in-chief of the Panamanian national Defence Forces, to destabilize the situation in the country, David Pere, ambassador of Panama to Costa Rica, told a press conference here.

He stressed that according to the information in his possession, the killing of Noriega was planned for December 15-16. The conspiracy involved U.S. Embassy officials in Costa Rica and Panama who supervised the work to set up covert weapons depots on the border between the two countries.

The role of direct executives of the plans was assigned to Cuban counter-revolutionaries from the so-called Brigade 2506. Mercenaries from this subversive group cobbled together by the U.S. CIA are known to have taken part in the armed incursion into Cuba in the area of

Playa Giron in 1961, which was backed up by the U.S. Army. The Panamanian ambassador named, in part, two Cuban counter-revolutionaries involved in the plot.

He approached the authorities of Costa Rica with a call to take all steps depending on them to head off the plotters' covert activity in the country's territory.

The plans to kill General Noriega and carry through other anti-Panamanian actions are designed, first and foremost, to stymie the treaties on the Panama Canal, under which the United States should turn this transoceanic way under full control of the Panamanian authorities by the year 2000, Pere said.

Political & Social

Sakharov Calls for Afghanistan Pullout

PM141429 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English
No 49, 6 Dec 87 p 2

["Letter to the Editor" by Academician Andrey Sakharov: "The Breakthrough Must Be Continued And Widened"—boldface as published]

[Text] The agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles is an event of tremendous political, military and psychological importance that diminishes the nuclear threat hovering over humankind. The two sides have agreed to have really effective mutual control. All of this is a sign of new thinking. It is extremely important that the breakthrough that has been achieved should be continued and widened.

I believe that the next step should be an agreement on a 50-per-cent reduction of the strategic nuclear forces — missiles and other intercontinental means of delivery. This agreement, I am convinced, can be reached irrespective of the problems of antimissile defence and any other political and military problems. My conviction in this respect is based on what has been universally recognized by all experts as low efficiency and vulnerability of SDI in the foreseeable future. The 50-per-cent reduction of intercontinental nuclear forces under any conditions will not upset the strategic balance in the world, but, coupled with the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, will provide a totally new psychological and political atmosphere for the further advance towards a safer and more equitable world, for the solution of regional conflicts in an atmosphere of greater trust, and for further nuclear disarmament. More through-going nuclear disarmament (by more than 50-per-cent) is predicated after a mutually acceptable solution of the problem of limiting antimissile defence and research of new military technology in conditions of mutual control, equilibrium and reduction of conventional armaments, political and military measures conducive to mutual security and confidence (such as, for example, the creation of fully demilitarized corridors in Europe and other regions), and greater openness in society.

In application to the USSR the following, I believe, brooks no delay: 1) elimination of a seat of mistrust in a vast region, discontinuation of the suffering of the Afghan people and of the death of Soviet soldiers, the swift withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan; 2) the unconditional release and rehabilitation of all those condemned for their convictions and non-violent actions connected with these convictions (at the beginning of this year 200 persons were released, as far as I know, but not rehabilitated). This would be instrumental in bringing about international trust.

In the foreseeable future I consider it possible and necessary for the USSR to implement a bold step - to unilaterally reduce the term of service in the army, navy and air force with a simultaneous reduction of every type of armament.

The funds released in the world, notably in the USSR, thanks to disarmament, will make it possible to solve pressing social, economic and ecological problems nationally and internationally.

For the USSR, disarmament, along with democracy, glasnost and the eradication of dogmatism and stagnation in very sphere of life - economic, cadre and social - constitutes a major component of perestroika, a source of its strength.

On the general historical plane it is possible to save humankind from thermonuclear and ecological self-destruction, I believe, only through profound changes in the direction of society's openness, observance of human rights, the drawing together (convergence) of capitalist and socialist systems coupled with renunciation of biased attitudes, dogmatism and messianism, and with real equality of all nations and races on our planet.

Zaykov Addresses Moscow Gorkom Plenum

PM111615 Moscow MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 6 Dec 87 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Moscow CPSU Gorkom Plenum"]

[Text] A Moscow CPSU Gorkom plenum was held 4 December.

It discussed the tasks of transition to the new conditions of economic management, set by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at the 4 December conference in the party Central Committee.

The plenum was addressed by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

The fundamental importance of raising the standards of organizational and political work aimed at unconditional fulfillment of plan targets and socialist pledges for the current year was noted. It is literally a matter of days, and much still remains to be done.

The main point in industry is to achieve 100% fulfillment of the contractual deliveries plan. Many enterprises and entire rayons in the capital are successfully solving this task. But this is no excuse for failures elsewhere. Steady work by some collectives cannot make up for the failures and breaches of delivery discipline by others.

Questions of capital construction demand particular attention by party committees at all levels and by soviet and economic organs at the closing stage of the year. A tense situation prevails there.

The entire package of construction industry problems will be examined in the party gorkom in the immediate future. The management structure of Moscow's construction industry conveyor belt will have to be seriously examined, and measures will have to be elaborated to prevent the development of a situation whereby the bulk of newly built projects is handed over in the last few days of the year. Even so the work is done carelessly and poorly.

It is impermissible that the commissioning of schools and vocational and technical schools is still being planned for the last quarter and even for December, despite the party Central Committee's strict demand that such projects should be handed over before the start of the academic year. The Moscow Gorispolkom Planning Commission must amend the annual plans accordingly.

The time left until year's end must be utilized to the utmost benefit so as to prepare solid starting positions for the transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing, the entry into force of the Law on the State Enterprise, and the expansion of the scope of state acceptance, including in the construction industry. Primary responsibility for this is, of course, borne by enterprises' economic and party leaders. In close contact with labor collective councils, they must create an atmosphere in which every worker is clearly aware of his responsibility, his tasks, his economic role, and, finally, the benefits accruing to him from the economic reform. Work must be done in such a way as to ensure that labor collective councils gain a certain amount of experience in self-management even prior to the introduction of the Law on the Enterprise.

It is clear that these tasks cannot be solved without the involvement of management links at rayon, city, and sector level. Hence, it is the duty of party raykoms and Moscow CPSU Gorkom departments not only to monitor progress in the fulfillment of this year's plans at local level but also, jointly with the ministries, to ensure that there are no uncertainties left as regards the questions which will have to be solved from the very first days of the new year.

The party gorkom plenum has been held right after the conference in the CPSU Central Committee, which very objectively and scrupulously analyzed the state of affairs and tasks regarding the preparedness of sectors, enterprises, and organizations for transition to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing organically linked with the deepening of restructuring and the further democratization of social life.

It is very important, the conference noted, to eliminate as soon as possible any shortcomings existing in work on the introduction of the new economic mechanism.

The unstable financial position of many of Moscow's enterprises is a particular cause for serious concern. In the new conditions of economic management this may have negative consequences both economically and socially. Consequently, measures to improve enterprises' finance are now among the most important and most urgent. Here it is necessary to act strictly in conformity with the Law on the State Enterprise.

There are many reprimands made at local level as regards the placement of state orders, the conclusion of economic contracts, and the preparation of production for the fulfillment of next year's plan. For many enterprises, and especially in machine building, state orders account in full for the entire production program and at times are even in excess of production capacity. In other words, we have—just as before—a superior organization exercising its diktat when plans are drawn up. This fetters the initiative of enterprises in determining a specific products range taking consumer requirements into account.

Despite the fact that this year Gosstab local organs, ministries and departments, and associations and enterprises have had considerably more time to conclude contracts, this work is still not completed and state orders are not coordinated with the actual potential of individual enterprises and their available resources. And some soviet and party organs in the city and rayons have detached themselves from this important work.

Thorough attention must be given to the question of giving enterprises broader opportunities to apply the funds they earn to the development of production and the social sphere so as not to undermine the labor collectives' faith in the efficiency of the new economic mechanism.

The elaboration, finalization, and enhanced substantiation of economic normatives must be completed with utmost speed.

The transfer of scientific organizations to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing must become an important link in the restructuring of the economic mechanism. But numerous institutes are still unprepared for work in the new fashion. Very often, and in the guise of transferring to economic accountability [khozraschet], they retain largely the old methods of centralized financing of scientific institutions. The party gorkom and raykoms must certainly monitor these issues and assist in their swiftest solution.

The restructuring of internal economic accountability [khozraschet] is progressing only slowly in many enterprises, the transfer to collective contracts is held back, and the level of economic training remains low. The

result of this is that workers are not directly informed of the demands of economic accountability [khozraschet]. The transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet] is still not being linked to the introduction of new wage rates and salary scales to be funded from enterprises' own resources. All these questions must be immediately resolved.

The city party organization and all its cadres are now undergoing a serious test of their maturity, of their ability to work in the new fashion not in words but in deeds. Tasks involved in the introduction of the new economic mechanism and democratization must determine the content of party meetings and raykom plenums held to hear reports by committees and bureaus on their leadership of restructuring. The party Central Committee attaches great political importance to them.

Unfortunately, by no means all the meetings already held at primary party organizations have met the demands of the time. Many of them were held in the old style, formally, without producing the expected result. The Kiyevskiy Party Raykom plenum was no exception in this regard. One can only agree with the critical conclusions contained in the MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA report. Today, however, it is necessary to draw one more, perhaps main conclusion: Responsibility for this failure must also be borne by the party gorkom departments, in addition to the Kiyevskiy Raykom secretaries and Bureau members.

Restructuring is a qualitatively new process for us all; our work involves many unknown quantities. In these circumstances, local party organizations and party raykoms need comradely support, businesslike advice, and specific assistance. We are in no way talking about curbing the independence of rayon links. Comrades in rayon and primary organizations must be helped to make their reports a proper source for imparting new energy to party work in the city at a time when the entire party has embarked on preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

At this stage of transformations, the task of party committees is to channel the labor energy of the people, of all party links, and of all social organizations toward the solution of two key tasks: giving vitality to the fundamental economic reform and deepening the processes of democratization. Implacable struggle against conservatism, against pretended restructuring, against divergence between words and deeds—this is the main meaning of the discussion which must be conducted at party raykom plenums. It must be followed up by specific actions to expand self-management and glasnost, to develop initiative, and to ensure people's active participation in the elaboration and implementation of decisions. Much more work still remains to be done in this regard from both the organizational and the propaganda viewpoint.

New practical steps to expand glasnost are currently being taken in Moscow with the backing of the party Central Committee. The PRAVDA editorial board has suggested opening a special correspondent's office in the city for the purposes of deepening the permanent and close contacts between the editorial office and the Moscow Gorkom and providing fuller coverage of the progress of restructuring in the capital. In addition to this, a new creative subdivision has been established—a TASS editorial desk for Moscow news (MOSTASS), which will supply the press in Moscow and the entire country with effective coverage of the work experience of the capital's party committees, the problems of the transfer to the new conditions of economic management, and news from the social sphere and culture, in other words all aspects of Muscovites' life.

The city party organization has at its disposal the country's strongest ideological potential and, especially since the October jubilee events, has the richest of material for explanatory and educational work. But the utilization of this potential is still unsatisfactory. It is necessary to substantially boost ideological work both within labor collectives and at the population's places of residence. Especially in view of the fact that the content of our propaganda and agitation abounds with exceptionally important topics linked with the introduction of the Law on the Enterprise, the introduction of economic accountability [khozraschet], and the expansion of state acceptance.

To put it briefly, major work lies ahead of us all in the economic, social, and spiritual spheres, and it must be skillfully translated into specific deeds, ensuring that tangible results are produced for people at every step.

In this context, a few words about trade during the pre-New Year holiday period and other city affairs.

Monitoring, and monitoring again of the work by trade and public catering organizations; efficient and most effective monitoring. While preparing for trade fairs, the other types of trade services must not be overlooked. Reports by Muscovites are highly alarming. Either bakeries have received no bread, or there are breakdowns in milk or meat products supplies. Yet the city has been allocated significant resources. But they are not always promptly utilized through the fault of trade organizations.

Those responsible for the solution of these problems at rayon level must be called most strictly to account. No references to so-called objective reasons will be accepted as an excuse. Remiss workers hoping that demandingness, including demandingness by the law enforcement organs, may slacken are hoping in vain.

There is still too much disorganization and economic mismanagement. Take the question of street cleaning, for example. As soon as snow falls, the entire system of the Moscow Gorispolkom's Main Administration for

Road Building and Exploitation breaks down, and many of the city's streets become impassable. Yet the proper snowfalls are yet to come. Every rayon must have strictly substantiated estimates of its needs for snow-clearing equipment depending on the intensity of the fall.

All these matters of daily routine must be solved at local level, in rayispolkoms and their services. Leaders of soviets and soviet deputies must justify the voters' trust by deeds. Inertia, apathetic idleness, and self-satisfaction are incompatible with restructuring.

O.A. Korolev, secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, then delivered a report on immediate measures for the unconditional fulfillment of the state plan for Moscow's economic and social development and of socialist pledges by the city's working people in 1987.

A report on the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau's work in the period between August and December 1987 by Yu.A. Belyakov, secretary of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom, was taken next.

The plenum examined organizational questions.

In connection with I.D. Pisarev's election as first deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom, the plenum relieved him of his duties as party gorkom secretary and member of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Bureau. V.K. Belyaninov, previously working as first secretary of the Volgogradskiy party raykom, was elected secretary and member of the Bureau of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom.

The plenum appointed A.Ya. Nemtinov, working as chief of the party gorkom's Administrative Organs Department, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Party Organizational Work Department. V.V. Skitev, who previously held this office, was relieved of duties as chief of the Party Organizational Work Department in connection with a transfer to work in the Moscow Gorispolkom.

V.S. Samorodov, previously working as CPSU Central Committee instructor, was appointed chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom Economic Department. D.G. Chernik was relieved of duties as chief of this department in connection with his appointment as chief of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Financial Administration.

V.F. Chernyshov, previously working as deputy chief of the department, was appointed chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorispolkom's Administrative Organs Department.

The plenum appointed V.A. Martin, previously working as first secretary of the Moskvoretzkiy CPSU Gorkom, chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom General Department. A.N. Tsaregorodtsev was relieved of duties as chief of the Moscow CPSU Gorkom General Department in connection with transfer to other work.

N.A. Zolotarev, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Party Organizational Work Department, took part in the plenum's work.

Shcherbitskiy Addresses Kiev Gorkom Plenum
PM141053 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 Dec 87
Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Being Equal to the Tasks of Restructuring"]

[Text] Kiev, 12 Dec—All organizational and political work must be equal to the level of the new tasks set by the 27th CPSU Congress and life itself. A Kiev party gorkom plenum held today made this appeal to the more than 230,000-strong detachment of Communists in the Ukrainian capital. In an atmosphere of businesslike efficiency, high principle-mindedness, criticism, and self-criticism its participants discussed a party gorkom report on the leadership of restructuring delivered by party Gorkom First Secretary K.I. Masik.

The gorkom bureau's activity in conditions of the expanding processes of democratization and glasnost and the struggle to accelerate the country's socioeconomic development was comprehensively analyzed in the report and in the speeches by I.A. Chub, milling machine operator at the V.I. Lenin "Arsenal" Plant; B.V. Soldatenko, first secretary of Leningradskiy party raykom; D.G. Topchiya, general director of the "Kiyevskiy Radiozavod" Production Association; V.G. Salnikov, first deputy chairman of the gorispolkom; A.P. Martynenko, chief of the Kiev City Main Administration for Housing and Civil Construction; Ukrainian SSR People's Artist L.G. Bakshtayev, party organization secretary at the L. Ukrainka Russian Drama Theater; and others. Emphasis was placed on the need to learn practical lessons from the experience of the first stage of restructuring, to consolidate and develop the emerging positive trends, and to implement measures for the elimination of existing shortcomings. It was said that it is necessary to persistently aim to boost the activeness of party committees and primary party organizations, and of all Communists, and to take public opinion more fully into account when solving questions affecting the working people's vital interests.

The plenum participants gave much attention to questions concerning the education, training, and placement of cadres. It is necessary to patiently help them master the new demands, to teach them to work in the conditions of the new economic mechanism, and to evaluate their activity according to the practical results achieved. There must also be greater demandingness toward leaders of all ranks as regards the observance of party and state discipline, socialist legality, and moral behavior. Anyone displaying immodesty, arrogance, and a scornful attitude toward people must be most strictly taken to

task; incompetent workers must be decisively removed, and a struggle must be waged against any manifestations of bureaucratism, departmentalism in work, and regionalism.

The plenum participants said that, at the second stage of restructuring, it is necessary to display high standards of endurance and staunchness, not to give up in the face of difficulties, to act selflessly and energetically, and to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of targets for the current year and the 5-year plan as a whole.

Ye.Z. Razumov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Organizational-Party Work Department, addressed the plenum participants.

The plenum was addressed by V.V. Shcherbitskiy, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Having set a firm course aimed at the implementation of revolutionary restructuring in all spheres of socialist society, he said, our party has taken a big responsibility on its shoulders. In the broad historical and general political context the tasks of deepening it were concretized in M.S. Gorbachev's report at the jubilee celebrations in Moscow and his speech at the meeting of party and movement representatives held afterward.

The entire cause of restructuring and the shaping of the new political thinking has been given a new impetus—in both the theoretical and the practical respects. The results of the third Soviet-U.S. summit in recent years have been the first real result of the assertion of new approaches in the international arena, the result of our peace offensive against the threat of thermonuclear war.

The conclusion of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles has become an event of historic significance because this treaty meets the cherished hopes and aspirations of all peoples. It has not only made a start on nuclear disarmament, it is not only changing the strategic situation in Europe, but it has also become a real step toward the examination of other vitally important international problems, including those linked with the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations.

Like all Soviet people, the people of the Ukraine have reacted to the Soviet-U.S. talks with profound satisfaction and will do everything possible to increase their contribution to strengthening our socialist state's might.

As throughout the party, preparations for the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference have begun in the republic party organization. Party committee plenums and Communists' meetings at which reports from elected organs on their work in leading restructuring are now being discussed constitute an integral part of our preparations. This most important political campaign shows that in

the republic the activeness of Communists and all working people is increasing and their aspiration to successfully resolve tasks whose complexity and crucialness are growing immeasurably at the new stage of restructuring is intensifying.

If we assess the course of these reports as a whole, they indisputably testify that changes in the necessary direction, and first and foremost in the matter of democratization, radical economic reform, and work with cadres, are obvious and gathering momentum.

According to the preliminary data, the main national economic targets for the first 2 years of the 5-year plan will be fulfilled. The rates of growth achieved in industrial production and labor productivity are higher than planned. The targets for the extraction of coal and iron and manganese ore and the production of finished rolled metal, coke, mineral fertilizers, and many types of consumer goods are being overfulfilled. The gross grain crop this year exceeded 50 million tonnes, which is 7 million tonnes more than last year. More grain, meat, milk, and other types of agricultural produce than planned have been purchased.

The social program is also being successfully implemented. More housing, hospitals and health centers, and cultural and consumer service facilities than envisaged by the 5-year plan are being commissioned.

At the same time many processes, particularly during the transition to the new conditions of economic management, are finding the going difficult and proceeding unevenly in different fields and different places. Arrears in contractual deliveries of output are increasing, and output quality is rising only slowly.

All this testifies that changes for the better are slow in coming and the necessary breakthrough right across the board has still not happened. It is the duty of party and Soviet organs and economic services to find out what is happening, who and what is retarding these processes, and take off the brakes.

V.S. Shcherbitskiy went on to dwell on the situation in the Kiev city party organization. He stressed that changes for the better are taking place in the style and methods of the gorkom bureau's work but there are still many unresolved tasks in the matter of restructuring. What has been done far from matches the possibilities, the tremendous potential, and the tasks facing the city party organization.

The party gorkom does not always have sufficient ability to single out the main thing and work out in depth the ways to resolve the urgent tasks. There is sometimes a lack of persistence and purposefulness in pursuing the objectives which have been set. Success has still not been achieved in raising all the city's party committees and primary party organizations and many labor collectives to the level required by restructuring.

New thinking, a new mentality, and new methods and approaches are needed to resolve the complex tasks of the second stage of restructuring, whose essence consists of implementing in practice everything that has been planned. It is perfectly clear that the success of the matter will depend primarily on the dynamism of the restructuring of party work itself.

Today the CPSU Central Committee is orienting us toward a definite change in the functions of party committees and the increasingly complete assertion of political methods of leadership. Under the conditions of the further democratization of the life of society it is necessary to learn to resolve complex task not by issuing commands and supplanting soviet and economic organs but by developing and channeling the activeness of the masses and organizing and coordinating their efforts through party organizations and cadres.

Yet it is precisely in work with cadres that there are considerable defects and shortcomings in the Kiev city party organizations; the perspective which is so necessary here is absent. There is no real reserve for the leadership of many crucial sectors. So when there is a need for cadre changes a feverish search for candidates often begins. The cadre reserve is often formed without being discussed in party organizations. All this testifies that the gorkom bureau and primarily the gorkom secretaries responsible for this important matter, K.I. Masik and S.M. Martynyuk, and also bureau member A.S. Yakovenko are in no hurry to break with old, unproven approaches in cadre work.

The party gorkom bureau must embark more boldly on the broadening of democracy and glasnost in cadre work and make better use of the city party organization's potential. The training of cadres must also be handled better.

V.V. Shcherbitskiy noted that a number of enterprises which switched to full economic accountability and self-financing at the beginning of the year have recorded worse economic performance indicators.

There are several reasons for this. But one of the main ones lies in the fact that nobody took care in time to train team leaders, foremen, and shop chiefs in the fundamentals of economic accountability relationships or improve their economic training. This is still being repeated now, when a further large group of enterprises is switching to economic methods of management. The party gorkom and raykoms have essentially failed to monitor how the middle echelon, workers, and trade union organizations of enterprises are preparing for this transition.

There has been a great deal of talk about new forms of work in the gorkom recently. This is good; it is necessary to seek new ways and experiment. But this must not be turned into an end in itself, into a campaign. One must

also not forget the tested forms of work which have confirmed their viability. Everything must work to benefit the cause and achieve results.

But what often happens in practice? As you know, the party gorkom bureau has recently heard reports from a number of gorkom secretaries and department chiefs, the gorispolkom chairman, and all his deputies. If you judge their work by city newspaper reports on gorkom bureau sessions you get the impression that all of them are manifestly failing to cope with the matters entrusted to them, that they have all recorded total failures. People quite naturally ask: Why then have they been left in their posts?

This kind of approach hardly helps the cause. Accountability reports and constructive criticism are necessary. But they must necessarily be followed by concrete actions to eliminate the shortcomings noted, about which people must be extensively informed.

The first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee went on to dwell on questions relating to the socioeconomic development of the republic's capital. It was noted, in particular, that Kiev, a major scientific center, has slipped back and to some extent lost its reputation in the matter of accelerating scientific and technical progress. The proportion of output in the top quality category has even declined recently, first and foremost at enterprises in Darnitskiy, Moskovskiy, and some other rayons. In Kiev, which has such a powerful scientific and production base, not a single tape recorder, color television, or radio receiver has been certified as being in the top quality category.

The problem of reducing manual labor also remains acute. The proportion of such labor at industrial enterprises and in construction is declining extremely slowly. At the same time the "Labor" program's targets for reducing the number of manual workers are regularly not fulfilled. Work on job certification and rationalization is also underrated. In the Glavkiyevgorstroy [Kiev Gorispolkom Main Administration for Housing and Civil Construction], for example, only one-third of jobs have been certified.

Sometimes the gorkom bureau does not analyze the reasons for the situation in depth and when eliminating shortcomings places more reliance on administrative and voluntarist methods and various conferences and meetings. But what is needed is resolute action and specific organizational work in labor collectives.

As of January 1988, V.V. Shcherbitskiy stressed, more than one-third of the republic's enterprises, producing 55% of industrial output, will be operating in conditions of full economic accountability and self-financing. The party gorkom bureau, all party organizations, soviet and economic organs, and, of course, enterprise leaders first and foremost must analyze time and again enterprises' readiness for work in the new conditions.

Particular attention must be devoted to the shaping of economic normatives and state orders, the conclusion of contracts for the supply of output, the transition to the new conditions of labor remuneration, the introduction of intraplant economic accountability, and the improvement of enterprises' financial position. It is particularly important at this time to display concern for the creation of a healthy and creative atmosphere in labor collectives.

The party gorkom bureau and gorispolkom must be systematic and more persistent in resolving tasks linked with improving the conditions of Kiev citizens' life, labor, and everyday existence. Because today there are serious complaints about the situation in the social sphere in the city.

This applies primarily to housing construction and the state of the housing stock and the strengthening of repair and construction organizations' facilities. Year after year the city economy is poorly prepared for the winter.

The prime culprit in the situation which has developed is the gorispolkom. Its leadership uses old yardsticks, and no real aspiration to get out the rut can be seen. Many years ago the gorispolkom reserved for itself the solution of the most important questions of the city's life. But now, when Kiev has grown considerably, the city services are manifestly not coping with this.

Party gorkom bureau member and gorispolkom chairman V.A. Zgurskiy, who needs to radically change the style of both his own work and that of the gorispolkom, has a particularly great deal to answer for with respect to all these shortcomings.

Under the conditions of the further development of democracy and the broadening of glasnost, when persuasion is becoming the main method, the role of ideological and mass political work is increasing considerably. Today it must be aimed primarily at shaping a political ethos in people, at underpinning the radical economic reform with a solid foundation of democratization.

As is known, the interest of the public, and particularly of young people, in questions of culture and our history has now intensified. Our academics, writers, and figures active in the arts are submitting a considerable number of ideas and proposals for the development of the city's spiritual life and the organization of worthwhile leisure. This is good. It is also necessary to rely on this activeness.

However Gorkom Secretary V.I. Mikhailovskiy and the party gorkom's ideological departments do not always keep up with events and Kiev citizens' growing requirements. For example, a republic government resolution on the creation of an "Ancient Kiev" protected historical and cultural zone has been adopted taking the public's wishes into account. The implementation of what is contemplated could be backed up by the efforts of the city's inhabitants. But this is not being done. But interest

in Kiev and its unique monuments is growing particularly in connection with the upcoming 1,000th anniversary of the introduction of Christianity in Rus.

It is also necessary to take account of the fact that often culturological [kulturologicheskiy] problems also become the target of political speculation. There must not be an unprincipled attitude to instances when some comrades, including party members, use glasnost and the development of democracy as a pretext for misrepresenting and tendentiously and sensationalistically interpreting individual historical facts without making any constructive proposals here. A wait-and-see attitude is intolerable in ideological questions, especially during a turning-point period. Communists and primarily leaders must defend the party line in a well argued and convincing manner and resolutely combat any attempts to utilize the processes of democratization and glasnost for purposes far removed from the tasks of restructuring.

The main role in implementing the tasks of the socioeconomic and cultural development of the republic's capital belongs to the Communists and all the city's working people, of course. Therefore it is very important for work to be substantially intensified, implacability toward shortcomings increased, and tangible changes for the better resolutely sought at every level—from the party gorkom bureau to the primary organization.

The attention paid to advanced experience should be intensified, and everything of value that emerges in the course of restructuring must be garnered literally grain by grain and brought into play.

Live, daily work in primary party organizations and labor collectives must become the main element in every party worker's activity. The main thing here is to rectify, advise, and support, not just look for shortcomings. Today, when the practical implementation of everything that has been planned is coming to the fore, the organizational role of the party and every Communist is assuming decisive significance.

Volyn Obkom Bureau Scored at Plenum

PM141205 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian
12 Dec 87 p 2

[Report by correspondent S. Luzgan under the rubric "Party Life: Facets of Restructuring": "Act More Vigorously, in the Spirit of the Times, Is What Was Urged by the Participants in the Volyn Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom Plenum Which Discussed the Bureau Report on the Leadership of Restructuring"]

[Text] Ukrainian SSR—Both in the preparation for and during this plenum, which for the first time collectively analyzed the party obkom bureau's activity there was much that was unusual and unwonted. In order to study public opinion more fully, the oblast newspaper RADYANSKA VOLYN published a request from the obkom bureau to the oblast's Communists and working people

and the theses of the report. Meetings took place between obkom secretaries and obkom members and candidate members, party veterans, Communists, the elected aktiv of the soviets, trade union, Komsomol, and people's control, and with workers of the administrative organs. Party committee members were polled. The theses of the bureau report were discussed in many primary party organizations. Over 300 proposals and comments came in which were used in preparing the definitive version of the report.

Delivering the report, L.I. Pavlenko, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, comprehensively analyzed the activity of the obkom bureau and its secretaries in restructuring organizational-party and ideological educational work. The plenum participants were unanimous in their assessment of the bureau's work. They noted that so far restructuring is being carried out at an inadequate pace, without proper dynamism.

The party obkom secretaries heard impartial criticism levelled against them at the plenum. For instance, serious complaints were levelled against S.A. Kupriyanov for omissions in the work of the construction organizations of which he is in charge. In particular it was noted that, although he visits the labor collectives, the effectiveness of these visits is still slight and no attention is paid to the work of the party grassroots.

The plenum participants drew the attention of obkom secretary I.M. Sementsov, in charge of the agro-industrial complex, to the marked lag of the processing industry capacities, which is delaying the development of the oblast's entire agrarian sector. Instead of influencing production with forms and methods appropriate to the party committee, the secretary often tries to usurp the leaders and specialists of the oblast agroprom.

Party second secretary V.I. Blazhenchuk also had to hear reasoned criticism levelled against him. There is still no clear-cut demarcation between the party obkom departments regarding the sphere of the application of their efforts. Verification of execution is only feebly established. The following examples were cited. Of 348 critical remarks made at the last oblast party conference, half have still not been acted on. This year the party gorkoms and raykoms received 298 documents of various kinds. These are mainly obkom plenum, bureau, and secretariat resolutions. Some 40 bureau sessions adopted 747 resolutions. B.I. Zbrovarnyy, first secretary of the Lot'sk party gorkom, in particular, stressed that the activity of the obkom bureau must be assessed primarily not by the number of decisions taken but by how it influences the rayon, city, and party committees. So far this influence cannot be felt much.

Speaking of the work of Obkom First Secretary L.I. Pavlenko, elected to the post 5 months ago, the plenum participants noted that in this relatively brief period Leonid Ivanovich has been able to study the situation in

the oblast party organization and, by relying on its healthy forces, has introduced much that is new and out of the ordinary to the bureau's work. This was confirmed in his speech by V.G. Fedorov, member of the obkom bureau and chairman of the oblispolkom. He noted that much has improved in the bureau's work style. There is more collegiality and exactingness. Whereas only recently the main efforts of the bureau members went on investigating various conflicts, frequently artificially created, today their attention is focused on specific deeds and specific problems of restructuring.

On behalf of all bureau members the first secretary stated:

"We can clearly see that the desired changes have failed to occur on individual sectors. Shortcomings in economic and social development and in organizational and educational activity are a serious omission in the style of work of the bureau and of the secretaries and apparatus of the obkom as a whole.

"This talk of party-style directness and exactingness was in my opinion predetermined by many preceding events in the oblast party organization's life. To put it bluntly, for a long time it had no luck with its first leaders. On each occasion a leading worker of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee recommended a candidate for the post of first secretary. Trusting the authority of the higher-ranking organ, the obkom members automatically voted for the recommended candidate. A certain amount of time would elapse and the party leader thus elected would rise above all the obkom members and even above his bureau and gradually acquire a veneer of bronze [bronzovel] as they say and feel himself to be outside control, outside criticism. The time would come and we would be obliged to remove him from his post. But once again he would be removed following an order from above. Here is what is characteristic: None of those who recommended him would bear responsibility for the candidate who had turned out badly.

"Some 5 months ago Z.S. Kovalchuk and V.I. Zhibrov, respectively first and second secretaries of the Volyn Obkom, received strict party sanctions and were relieved of their posts for serious shortcomings in their work—violations of collegiality, blunders in cadres policy, and even deviation from socialist legality. Obkom Secretary I.M. Sementsov and Ye.I. Kurlchuk, member of the obkom bureau and chairman of the oblast agroprom, were penalized for serious shortcomings. Obkom department chiefs I.V. Pustyl'te, A.I. Stupakov, and A.M. Voytsekhovskiy and P.S. Melnichuk, chairman of the obkom party control commission, were relieved of their posts."

The serious disruptions in the work of the obkom have also had an adverse effect on the activity of the rayon echelon. Several party raykom secretaries who have compromised themselves have received strict party penalties and have been relieved of their posts. The

report and speeches voiced the same opinion: The appropriate conclusions must be drawn from the errors of the past to ensure that yesterday's pernicious practice is not repeated today. There are now new people in the obkom bureau. They are called on to rid themselves of the chronic disease which has persisted for many years and to open up broad scope for the activation and mobilization of those party forces which are rethinking party work not verbally but in deeds to ensure that its style and methods fully accord with the tasks of restructuring.

The oblast has acquired a markedly more rapid momentum recently. For instance, this year the biggest grain harvest in the entire history of the Volyn area has been harvested and the plans for the production and sale of the main produce of fields and stock units have been fulfilled and overfulfilled. There are marked improvements in the development of industry and in the social sphere. These good changes, the plenum stressed, must be not only consolidated but also developed. On this basis a fundamental breakthrough must be achieved in the oblast's socioeconomic development.

Life persuades us that the success of restructuring depends primarily on how far the party organizations are able to put into operation and to activate the human factor and its creative potential and to ensure in practice the Communists' vanguard role. The activation of the work of the primary party organizations and the enhancement of the role of every party member in the collective and through him of every worker—that is the range of fundamental questions which the plenum participants put foremost. The plenum noted that the party committees and primary organizations are now always the creators of public opinion and the moral and psychological mood in the labor collectives. Obsolete forms and methods of ideological work incompatible with the atmosphere of glasnost and democracy have not been completely eliminated. Some party workers avoid open discussions on crucial issues and fail to pay proper attention to individual work with people.

Moreover ideological and mass political work does not always consider the fact that gangs of Ukrainian bourgeois nationalists used to operate in the Volyn area as they did in other Western oblasts of the republic. The atheistic education of working people is badly organized in the oblast and new socialist rights are being instilled only feebly. For many years the ideological sector was headed by Obkom Secretary Ye.A. Polivanov. Subjected to serious criticism at the plenum and failing to find within himself the strength to restructuring the sector of party work in his charge, he has applied for retirement, as they say. The plenum satisfied his request to be relieved of his duties as member of the bureau and secretary of the obkom.

The plenum discussed with great concern the grave errors and blunders in cadres policy. In the past 7 years the chairmen of 279 of the oblast's 341 kolkhozes have been replaced.

"Today it must be said frankly," N.P. Ostapets, first secretary of the Manevichskiy party Raykom, said in his speech, "that the party obkom is still allowing serious shortcomings in the selection, placement, and education of cadres. There are instances of support for workers who have failed and who have abused their official position and of their protection from criticism.

The Volyn Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom plenum passed in a businesslike, frank atmosphere. Having analyzed comprehensively and in depth the style and methods of party leadership of restructuring, the plenum participants demanded that its new bureau remove more rapidly all obstacles from the path of renewal and skillfully put the levers of acceleration in motion.

Udmurt Leaders Scored for Law, Order Work
PM091035 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87
Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee. On Serious Shortcomings in the Activity of Communist Leaders of Udmurt ASSR Law-Enforcement Organs in Fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee Resolution of 20 November 1986 'On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests'"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee has examined the results of a check on the fulfillment in the Udmurt ASSR of the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986 "On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests" and adopted a corresponding decision on this question. It points out that the leaders of the autonomous republic's law-enforcement organs and CPSU members—Comrade V.M. Pokhodin, prosecutor; Comrade A.N. Mineyev, deputy minister of internal affairs; Comrade A.M. Shikhov, minister of justice; and Comrade I.M. Karpov, chairman of the Supreme Court—have taken an irresponsible attitude to the fulfillment of the said CPSU Central Committee resolution, tolerated serious shortcomings and violations in the work of the departments that they head, failed to display high exactingness toward cadres for the irreproachable execution of their official duty, and taken a passive stand in implementing restructuring in the assigned sectors.

As a result, work on ensuring strict observance of socialist legality and the strengthening of law and order has still not been widely developed in the autonomous republic, as demanded by the CPSU Central Committee. It is frequently carried out in a disorganized manner, to a low professional standard, without relying on the broad public and without the necessary glasnost.

The efforts of prosecutor's office workers are not properly concentrated on precise observance of the laws in the work of ministries and departments, local soviets,

and leaders of enterprises and organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhoses. Checks that are conducted on the execution of the laws on the safekeeping of socialist property do not always produce the desired results. Official and economic crime continue to affect state and cooperative trade most of all, where in 1986 alone deficiencies, thefts, and losses arising from product spoilage totaled R3.2 million, as well as enterprises of the agro-industrial complex, where losses doubled last year and exceeded R10 million. Little attention is paid to eradicating figure padding and deceit, and an assertive struggle is not waged against unearned income.

Prosecutor's office establishments carry out unsatisfactory supervision of examination and investigation, as a result of which numerous instances of the groundless detention of citizens and of criminal proceedings being instituted against them and the substandard investigation of criminal cases continue to occur. Whereas 11.6% of cases were examined in violation of the established deadlines in 1985, this year the figure is 16%. Investigative organs complete one case in every eight in violation of the law's demands. The number of cases referred by people's courts for additional investigation has almost doubled compared with 1985.

There has been no fundamental restructuring in the work of MVD services and subdivisions—which has had an adverse effect on the state of socialist legality and law and order. Thefts of citizens' private property have recently become more frequent in the autonomous republic, and the number of rapes has increased. There are more manifestations of hooliganism in a number of rayons. Almost one offender in every three is arrested in a state of intoxication. The passiveness of militia organs has been one cause of the growth in recidivist crime, which stands at 24% this year.

The situation is particularly bad in the cities of Izhevsk and Sarapul and in Kiyasovskiy, Syumsinskiy, and certain other rayons, where an atmosphere of complacency has developed and where leaders of administrative organs are not called strictly to account for the strengthening of law and order.

City rayon internal affairs organs continue to cover up crimes and keep them off the record, and crime detection is at a low level. In 1987 criminals who have committed 1,645 indictable offenses have remained unexposed.

The ASSR Ministry of Justice and Supreme Court superficially examine the work of people's courts, are failing to enhance their role in the struggle against offenses, and are directing their activities in an unsatisfactory way in terms of eliminating the causes which allow mercenary and other criminal manifestations to develop. The correct application of laws is not ensured in courts. For these reasons people's court sentences with regard to 128 citizens have recently been disaffirmed or changed. Supreme Court court collegiums permit substandard examination of cases.

Shortcomings in work with law-enforcement organ cadres are being eradicated only slowly. One employee in every four has been dismissed from the militia organs over the past 3 and 1/2 years, and more than half of them were dismissed for negative reasons. Almost all criminal investigation workers and more than half the specialists in the investigative apparatus of city rayon internal affairs organs were replaced during the same period. Disciplinary proceedings were instituted against 33 prosecutor's office and investigation workers for various violations and misdemeanors.

The Udmurt CPSU Obkom and the ASSR Council of Ministers do not carry out daily organizational and political work to fulfill the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986, do not display exactingness toward law-enforcement organs for the enhancement of their operating efficiency, and do not direct the attention of party gorkoms and raykoms and local soviets toward giving them practical assistance in intensifying the struggle against crime and eradicating all deviations from the law which infringe citizens' rights. The CPSU obkom and the ASSR Council of Ministers have taken a formal approach to discussion of the CPSU Central Committee resolution and failed to monitor its fulfillment.

This work has been carried out to a low standard in many party gorkoms and raykoms and in the primary party organizations of law-enforcement organs, where a clear-cut action program to strengthen law and order and further increase guarantees of citizens' rights also has not been drawn up.

Comrade V.M. Pokhodin, Udmurt ASSR prosecutor, has been reprimanded for serious shortcomings in work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution, for failing to take proper measures to strengthen socialist legality and law and order in the republic, and for weakening prosecutor's office supervision of examination and investigation.

A similar measure has been taken against Comrade A.N. Mineyev, Udmurt ASSR deputy minister of internal affairs, for unsatisfactory organization of work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution, for allowing the services under his jurisdiction to work at a low standard in terms of the timely exposure and detection of crimes, for relaxing the struggle against recidivist crime, and for failing to take proper measures to improve the quality of investigation and to retain cadres.

Comrade A.M. Shikhov, minister of justice, and Comrade I.M. Karpov, chairman of the Supreme Court, have been severely reprimanded for shortcomings committed in fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution of 20 November 1986, for unsatisfactory leadership of people's courts, and for serious omissions in court activity to eliminate the causes which enable mercenary and other criminal manifestations to develop.

The CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee reprimanded Comrade Yu.P. Kudyashev, chairman of the Udmurt ASSR Council of Ministers, for indiscipline manifested in organizing the fulfillment of party and government decisions on further strengthening socialist legality and law and order and increasing protection of citizens' rights and for lack of control exercised in this.

The attention of Comrade N.I. Smirnova, secretary of the Udmurt party obkom, was drawn to the low standard of organizational work on fulfilling the CPSU Central Committee resolution "On Further Strengthening Socialist Legality and Law and Order and Increasing the Protection of Citizens' Rights and Legitimate Interests" and to the lack of proper exactingness toward party gorkoms and raykoms for improving the political leadership of law-enforcement organs and organizing effective control over their work.

The committee took account of statements by the aforesaid leaders that they will take measures to eliminate the shortcomings exposed by the check and to fundamentally improve work on strengthening socialist legality and law and order in the republic and ensuring reliable protection of citizens' constitutional rights and legitimate interests.

Saratov Officials Jailed for Bribe-Taking

PM141508 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87
Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA correspondent A. Vorotnikov report under the rubric "From the Courtroom": "Bribes for the Plan"]

[Text] Saratov, 7 Dec—As is well known, there is much building going on in the countryside now. Naturally, any construction project begins with the plan. It is only a question of when it will be received: There is a waiting line at the design organizations.

"It could be speeded up," kolkhoz chairmen and sovkhoz directors were given to understand by L. Kryuchkova, leader of the Saratov Design and Estimate Group at the Chernomorkurortproyekt Institute, and V. Gnidenko, chief of the Saratov Architectural Design Shop at the Stavropol branch of the Rosproyekt Institute.

The bargaining began. Having received bribes from the farm leaders, Kryuchkova and Gnidenko rapidly drew up design documentation for various agricultural projects. Then, through Yu. Kireyev, deputy chief of department at the Saratov Oblast office of the USSR Gosbank, the documentation was submitted for financing.

So it went on for several years. In that time Kryuchkova received bribes from farm leaders totaling more than R7,000, Gnidenko—more than R4,000, and Kireyev R5,000.

The Volzhskiy People's Court in Saratov City cut short the criminal activity of these newly fledged schemers. Kryuchkova was sentenced to 8 years, Gnidenko and Kireyev to 6 years' imprisonment, all with confiscation of property.

'Civic Stance,' Exposure of Abuses Needed

PM081611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87
Second Edition p 1

[Ivan Podsvirov article under the rubric "Frank Discussion": "Stance or Ambition?"]

[Text] It is not for nothing that the restructuring now under way in the country is described as the continuation of the cause of Great October. It really is similar to our revolution in terms of the depth and scope of the socioeconomic and social transformations planned and already being implemented, in terms of the openness in discussing urgent problems and topics which at one time were considered "prohibited." We Soviet people are now involved in everything. We all, from worker to minister, are held responsible for the success of restructuring.

It has become the norm in the conditions of glasnost and democracy to criticize bureaucrats, cheats, and idlers for everyone to hear and without being afraid of the consequences, in other words to expose economic mismanagement, connivance, and other negative phenomena. The party relies on the working people's principledness, creative initiative, and activeness. Everything we have decided upon must be implemented, decisions must always be followed up by actions.

A civic stance gains its strength primarily from the sincere desire to overcome shortcomings and jointly change life for the better. Only by relying on public opinion will it be possible to establish discipline and organization in every collective and at every work place. A great role in this has to be played by party members.

"A Communist must always pursue a firm line of behavior and must struggle against lack of principledness," Z. Balashova, a worker at the Uralsk Standardization and Metrology Center, writes to PRAVDA. "You must, however, be aware that you may ruin your health and create problems for yourself. But the struggle is struggle. Once you have joined in, don't whimper. If you are convinced that you are right, pursue your goal!"

These are not empty words. The letter writer fought a protracted and real battle against a defective style of leadership, drunkenness, and official abuses in her collective. Instead of a strict appraisal of the facts, Balashova herself was subjected to systematic persecution. Initially she received adverse performance reports, later on she was debarred from performing any social functions. Finally, and altogether groundlessly, Zoya Petrovna was accused of accountancy and financial forgery and of... hooliganism, and was expelled from the CPSU.

It would seem that the worst had befallen her. But Balashova did not falter. She did not lose faith in the correctness of the work she had started. On the contrary, she continued her struggle against shortcomings. And justice triumphed. The Sverdlovsk CPSU Obkom Bureau ordered the Sverdlovsk Party Gorkom to investigate the situation in detail. Balashova's stance was firmly backed. Center Director L. Ignatyev was dismissed from office and Party Bureau Secretary K. Yuryev was expelled from the party. They did not get away with persecution for criticism.

"This proved to me yet again," Z. Balashova writes, "that people like Ignatyev, Yuryev, and their patrons are yesterday's men. If they do not understand today's demands and fail to restructure themselves, life will reject them."

As we can see, a Communist's stance is dictated by major state interests and vital concern for the success of the common cause. Readers' letters arriving daily in the editorial office testify that the majority of Soviet people are just as consistent and staunch in implementing the party's plans. With their shock labor and implacability toward shortcomings they express their firm stance—to be in the front ranks of restructuring.

Even so, though, notes of pessimism are often to be detected in the mail. "I found myself like a white crow among a flock of kites," N. Chalyy writes from Ulyanovsk. "I criticized, and nobody backed me. So why did I fight and why am I still fighting? I have been passed over for promotion and for housing...." Reading this, you automatically recall Z. Balashova's advice: "Once you have joined in the struggle, don't whimper!" If you are secretly dreaming of achieving some personal gains through your activeness, or wish to "fix" someone out of rancor, what sort of a "bold stance" is this?

Downright demagogues are often to be found among the "fighters for truth." An engineer from Saratov comes to the editorial office and, without pausing for breath, starts criticizing "totally useless local customs." He lists negative instances he has read about in the newspaper. "Just imagine, they dug a hole in front of my home. They have not filled it in for 2 years now. Disgraceful!" I asked the comrade: What has he personally done for the elimination of shortcomings? Why could he, together with his neighbors, not fill in the hole in question? "It is not up to me," he replied. "I am reporting it to you, now do something about it!"

There can be no argument that fair criticism, even when it is most biting, is necessary and useful. But there must be greater circumspection when assessing critical statements.

Is a principled stance at times not replaced by camouflaged lies and petty bourgeois malicious glee? Or open discussion by striving to assert oneself at the expense of glasnost or to settle accounts with incompatible workers?

These are not simple questions.... They must be borne in mind. Especially now, when elected organs are reporting back to party organizations in an atmosphere of broad glasnost and tasks for the future are being defined.

The supplanting of criteria and terms elaborated in the process of renewal is very harmful and consequently impermissible. But things like this do happen, unfortunately. For example, on the initiative of the Alekseyevskiy mixed feed plant leadership, the collective's meeting embarked on a discussion about reelecting the shop chief; an important event, or so it would seem; in the spirit of glasnost.

People discussed all aspects of the work of Shop Chief L. Menshikova. But when it came to taking a vote, Director B. Volkov said: Let us bide our time. The workers were indignant: Why bother them then, why stage an election show? It appeared that the director had simply decided to teach the "disobedient" social figure and rural soviet deputy a lesson. Let her see, he thought, who is more powerful. It seems that Kuybyshev Oblast's Kinel Party Gorkom ought to properly evaluate this incident....

What we need are an honest approach toward the work in hand and honest words without any perfidious intent. Only their combination determines a truly civic stance.

Problems in Forming Plant Councils Discussed
PM081451 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA
INDUSTRIYA in Russian 1 Dec 87 p 2

[Candidate of Philosophical Sciences A. Simakov article under the rubric "Restructuring of the Economy: The Law on the Enterprise": "Collective Director"]

[Text] The tumbledown roof in the workshop, supply, the results of competition and the *subbotnik*—these and dozens more very varied questions are being discussed today by labor collective councils, whose numbers are growing daily. What is this—a wish to encompass themselves all the acute problems of life within the plant? A desire to analyze and assess them "from below"? Or perhaps the members of some councils simply do not know where to apply their efforts? In order for labor collective councils to operate competently and usefully, it is necessary to clearly define their tasks and to grasp why production needs this new management organ today.

"Councils are being and will be created in enterprises whenever it is impossible to get by without them and it is impossible to manage production efficiently," Nikolay Ilich Travkin, organizer and inspirer of the economic councils, loves to repeat. They were the prototype for labor collective councils, whose status has been defined by the Law on the Enterprise. How can we fail to concur with such a standpoint!

Since the publication of the draft Law on the Enterprise, councils have begun to be actively created in many labor collectives. Is this because workers everywhere simultaneously realized for themselves the need for them? Alas... Many enterprises began to hastily elect councils after the relevant directives appeared from the sectorial ministries.

The reader is entitled to wonder whether this is such a bad thing. Ultimately what difference does it make if the initiative comes "from below" or "from above" when the matter is essentially necessary and useful. There is a difference! If only because the conditions which bring the new self-management organ into being directly affect its character, its powers, and its real and potential capabilities.

Let us recall how the idea of economic councils arose in Glavmosoblstroy [Main Administration for Construction in Moscow Oblast] trusts. The construction trust switched to the collective contract and a whole series of managerial questions immediately arose which the administration was unable to solve in the new conditions. Is the wages normative valid—for that is what ensures the fusion of personal and common interests? How can a reduction in labor-intensiveness really be secured without detriment to the worker? How can the work of all associated subdivisions be monitored? How can the trust leaders' coefficient of labor input be determined? Now, under contract conditions, the administration is not capable of resolving by its own will these and a multitude of other tasks which affect the material interest of every man and of the collective as a whole. In short, economic conditions themselves demanded the creation of a self-management organ. They also precisely indicated its field of activity—distribution relations.

They began with wages and gradually extended their influence to planning, supply, and cadre policy. But these questions too were only considered from the angle of the contract—has unity of personal and public interest been ensured? The more deeply economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] infiltrated the work of construction workers, the more vigorous the councils became. Economic accountability itself showed it what to tackle and how.

Let us now turn to the experience of the Moscow "Frezer" plant, where we recently conducted sociological research. There people told me that the discussion and approval of the "Plant Veteran" badge was one of the most important actions. They also talked with pride about how the council dispatched its courier to the neighboring plant to "root out" components in short supply. But, excuse me, why did the labor collective council have to tackle these matters? For in the first case this is the concern of the trade union committee, and in the second that of the supply department... Labor collective council members reacted uncomprehendingly to our doubts and even took umbrage: "What do you think we ought to do?" This happened because when the new

self-management organ was created in the plant there were no real conditions for its participation in production management. Thus they had to "invent" a plan of measures which did not have the slightest bearing on this, the main task.

Remember the notorious standing production conferences. They sprang up during the 1965 economic reform and were originally a kind of proving ground for testing out its ideas. But the reform "never got off the ground," yet the standing production conferences were legalized and given official status, and for 20 years they have dragged out a miserable existence, above all because the economic mechanism worked fine without them. Under conditions of rigid administrative management, any collective organ is at best a consultant with the right to a consultative vote. This truth, which not everyone has learned, was reaffirmed by the experience of creating labor collective councils in certain enterprises.

It has to be admitted that it was difficult for us all to realize the fundamental features of the new organ. It is no coincidence that the draft Law on the Enterprise invested labor collective councils with the modest right to "examine questions." The burden of former ideas and the experience of administration by decree prevailed in the economy. The correct and productive formula was adopted only after the debate and study of the same economic councils' practical achievements: "The labor collective council... resolves questions of improving the enterprise's management and organizational structure and ensures that workers' labor remuneration is in line with their personal contribution and that social benefits are distributed fairly; it adopts decisions on the utilization of the production development, science and technology, material incentives, and social development funds..."

The labor collective council can perform all these functions, as a "package," so to speak, only in conditions of profound economic accountability. But the question is: What about the collectives as yet unaffected by the changes? For the transition to new management conditions will be implemented gradually. Is it a case of waiting with arms folded until economic accountability infiltrates all production links? No, of course not. Especially as the basic provisions for the restructuring of economic management recommend the election of labor collective councils in all enterprises this year and next year. However, in embarking on elections, we must do our utmost to avoid the mistakes we have been discussing. It is not only pointless but harmful to duplicate them. First of all, the councils must be created not at the behest of the "upper echelons," but on the initiative of collectives. These collectives must themselves be "ripe" for economic accountability and feel the need for it. This is a sphere where party and trade union organizations can show their mettle and really get down to propagandizing and introducing contract relations. It is their direct duty to channel the newborn labor collective councils in the right direction and ensure that they tackle their business.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to begin with feasible tasks. It seems to me that the main one is the election of economic leaders. It is the councils which must prepare and organize them. This will indeed be their real contribution to democratizing management. Thus the labor collective council will immediately secure the support of a democratically elected administration and will be a real pillar of that administration in the struggle for economic restructuring. The workers will see in practice that the council is not merely another formal superstructure but a spokesman for their interests. Elections are only the first step, and others will, of course, follow in their wake. Labor collective councils' influence will gradually encompass a whole range of "economically accountable" problems, as economic councils in Travkin's trust managed to do.

It is alarming that many councils are not dealing with their own business today. Something else is no less alarming: Some councils are being created contrary to the democratic tenets of the Law on the Enterprise.

I view with perplexity the disputes around the composition of the councils, and there are many of them today. Must they include primarily workers? Do economic leaders have the right to chair them? Must the representation of all social and demographic groups be ensured? Never mind the disputes, councils are being created at some enterprises according to a prearranged pattern—such and such a percentage of workers, such and such a percentage of women, and an ordinary worker at the head at all costs... This is absurd and compromises the very idea!

The collective must not be curbed by any formal restrictions in electing the council. Except, of course, for one proviso: All production subdivisions must be represented in the self-management organ so that their material interests are not encroached upon. Expediency alone determines all the remaining proportions, including the question of the labor collective council leader. The plant director or trust manager can head it, he has the authority—and anyhow, he holds all the cards. The formal preferment of a worker over an engineer or a shop chief is no more than primitive playing at democracy. Please tell me, can a labor collective council really have a serious influence on production when, out of 49 members, it only has 2 workshop chiefs, 1 deputy, and 1 foreman? Of course not. Such a council will be forced to abandon serious production tasks by virtue of its own marginal competence. That is why the experience of economic councils, where engineering and technical cadres, team leaders, and foremen are broadly represented along with workers, is instructive. Indeed, the fact that they are headed by enterprise leaders in no way lessens their importance as democratic organs. The brilliant results of the work of the "Mosobslstroy" trusts is the best confirmation of this.

A "collective director"—this is how Travkin defined the essence of the new management organ. It is difficult not

to agree with him. Under the new conditions of economic activity, only such labor collective councils can be strategists and at the same time implement the party's economic policy.

Hundreds Fight North Caucasus Pipeline Fire

*PM141325 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 11 Dec 87 First Edition p 6*

[N. Gusarov report: "Accidents. What Happened On the Underground Line"]

[Text] Although December was not far off, the ground in Stavropol had not frozen and repair workers from the North Caucasus Petroleum Products Main Pipelines Administration continued to tackle their usual business. That day a team of nine was to have replaced the pipeline insulation on the 281st kilometer of the Grozny-Armavir underground line.

They unearthed a 200-meter length of pipe, attached it to a crane, and began to hoist its sections so that the workers could reach it. There was some excessive movement and the pipeline snapped. A stream of diesel fuel, which was being pumped down the line, gushed into the trench at tremendous pressure. Some stone or sliver of metal struck the pipe, caused a spark, and there was an explosion. Hundreds of tonnes of ignited fuel began to fill the pit...

As soon as the Stavropol Krayispolkom Internal Affairs Administration received word of the fire, several units and subunits of firefighters were immediately mustered. The personnel from the Nevinnomyssk support facility for extinguishing large fires and firefighters from Pyatigorsk, Mineralnyye Vody, and Georgiyevsk immediately drove out to the scene of the accident. A State Automobile Inspection Highway Patrol Service specialized squad, a separate company of the same designation from Nevinnomyssk, and the entire Andropovskiy Rayon Department of Internal Affairs were sent out to help them.

When Colonel V. Polosmak, who was directly in charge of the fire-extinguishing operation and deputy chief of the Kray Internal Affairs Administration, arrived at the pipeline, a terrible scene greeted him. Flames were raging over an area of almost 500 square meters. Fuel was continuing to flow into the trench and there was a real threat of spillage from the pit. One scarcely dares to think about what might have happened next—20 meters from the seat of the fire there was a high-pressure gas pipeline, a little further away, a highway, and beyond that houses and a clear, fast-flowing river. In addition it was, in practical terms, impossible to approach the trench from the windward side, where a strong wind was, albeit only slightly, blowing the flames away and attenuating the heat. The point was that it was there that the soil from the trench had been thrown and there was a high steep heap there.

...The explosion occurred at 0920 and by 1000 hours the fire fighting team had organized active work. V. Potikhonin, a 36-year old insulation worker, was injured at the time of the explosion. At the hospital where he was taken urgently it was determined that 40% of his body suffered burns. The doctors did everything they could and saved his life.

Viktor Ivanovich Polosmak organized a whole complex of protective measures. While 9 fire trucks were beating back the flames—by that time they had already managed to seal off the fuel line—powerful equipment was heaping up a dike so as not to permit the burning liquid to overflow. Militiamen quickly evacuated the repair workers who had been cut off by the fire and also evacuated local inhabitants who were in the vicinity.

They quickly dug a huge pit near the scene of the fire, a sort of storage facility for collecting the diesel fuel that had leaked out. Almost 100 men were occupied in the fire fighting and even more people performed this operation. A real battle was under way and V. Kristalinskiy, chief of the Kray Fire Prevention Administration, led the urgent operations and coordinated the efforts of hundreds of men.

It is impossible to enumerate all those who distinguished themselves in eliminating the fire, but we must nonetheless name a few names: These are Lieutenant Colonel G. Shatalov, Lieutenant A. Mikheyev, and Sergeants V. Dmitriyenko, G. Serdyukov, and A. Kalinnikov. Thanks to the bravery of the firefighters the fire was put out by 1330 hours. The competent organs began an investigation of the causes and circumstances of the accident. Fortunately there were no casualties this time...

The author of this article has frequently been at the scene of accidents and disasters recently and has frequently talked about them in this newspaper. He has often had to hear questions following his articles such as: What is happening and why are there so many accidents? I must say that they are not increasing in number, we have simply begun to talk about them more in the press. Contrary to idle comment, we are of the opinion that the more we talk about catastrophes in the press the less they will occur in life.

The first conclusions have already been drawn from the accident at the pipeline. But we are waiting to see what the RSFSR State Committee for the Supply of Petroleum Products North Caucasus Petroleum Products Main Pipelines Administration's labor collective will say.

Briefs

Satellite TV in Pamirs

A new Ekran space communications system relay allows Rushan Rayon in the Pamirs to receive two central television programs starting today. Currently there are 95 space communications stations in the Orbita,

Moskva, and Ekran systems in the Pamirs, as well as hundreds of kilometers of radio relay lines, ensuring good reception of two central television programs on 90% of the Pamirs territory. By the end of the year, two more major rayons of the Gorno-Badakhshan Autonomous Oblast are to get space links to Moscow. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 14 Dec 87 LD*]

Belorussian Magazine

The first issue of the political-social and literary-artistic magazine KRYNITSA was published today. It is an organ of the Belorussian Komsomol Central Committee and the Belorussian Writers' Union. The magazine is published in Russian and Belorussian. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 14 Dec 87 LD*]

Agricultural

Chelyabinsk Taken to Task Over Stockraising
*PM101027 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87
Second Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report: "In the CPSU Central Committee: On Serious Shortcomings in the Work of Chelyabinsk Oblast Party, Soviet, and Economic Organs To Assimilate Economic Factors of Intensification in Stockraising"]

[Text] Following the CPSU Central Committee May (1982) and April (1985) Plenums, the oblast's farms achieved a certain increase in milk and egg production and increased dairy herd and poultry productivity. The weight standards of livestock being sold also improved.

At the same time, the CPSU Central Committee considers that the level of organizational and political work by the party obkom and the oblispolkom on development of stockraising and of the agro-industrial complex as a whole fails to meet the vital tasks regarding the sector's intensification and, on this basis, the supply of locally produced meat and especially wholemilk products to the population.

Food program targets are not being met, and per capita meat production has declined. The growth of livestock products output in the last 4 years was less than 1%. Consequently, there has been a significant increase in deliveries of livestock products to the republic from union republic stocks.

Party, soviet, and economic organs have failed to ensure the objective assimilation of the new economic management mechanism by all production subdivisions, display inertia in restructuring, and underestimate the importance of the effective use of the economic factors of intensification in stockraising. Capital investments and material resources are not concentrated in key sections, and there is no further development of specialization. Extremely small amounts of money are invested in feed

production, especially in new technologies ensuring high feed quality and balanced content of protein and other important components. The development of the base for livestock, poultry, and milk processing is unsatisfactory. There is virtually no application of the normative-resource method when planning the purchases of meat, milk, and other products.

Oblast and rayon leadership officials are still in the grips of the old thinking, whereby targets for the output of livestock products are to be fulfilled regardless of costs.

The price mechanism being used is failing to produce the expected results. Purchase price supplements are introduced without economic justification, and these supplements are often received by farms with higher profitability levels while loss-making and low-profitability farms are deprived of supplements. Compared with 1983, the number of loss-making farms has increased 2.4 times. A considerable proportion of livestock products are of poor quality, one-fifth of cattle and two-thirds of sheep are undernourished and skinny, and around 20% of the sold milk is substandard. Less than 40% of livestock and 50% of milk are procured directly on farms and centrally shipped out.

Party, soviet, and economic organs are not giving proper attention to the transfer of kolkhozes and sovkhozes to full economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet] and self-financing. Economic laws are nearly always breached on the oblast's farms. As a rule, wages growth is considerably faster than productivity growth. Wage payments based on gross income have not been introduced, while gross income on one-third of farms is lower than actual wage costs. A significant proportion of stock units have not switched to the flowline-shop work system, other progressive forms of labor organization and wages are hardly applied, and the number of animals per employee in stockraising remains low.

Party, soviet, and economic organs and leaders and specialists on many farms have failed to adopt decisive measures on the broad introduction of intensive technologies for the cultivation of grain and feed crops and of advanced methods for the procurement, storage, and preparation of feeds. The productivity of fields, meadows, and pastures remains low, and feed procurement plans calculated on minimum satisfaction of stockraising's requirements are not being fulfilled. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been supplied with less than one-half of their capital requirements for hay storage facilities. The quality of feeds, especially of hay, haylage, and grass meal, is poor.

The oblast has a considerable scientific and technical potential. But the party, soviet, and economic organs do not place sufficient reliance on scientific forces, nor do they target the collectives of scientists toward the elaboration of progressive methods of stockraising and feed

production management. The institutes' scientific and experimental production farms fail to set an example of high standards of economic management.

There is still underestimation of the potential of citizens' and industrial enterprises' subsidiary farms for boosting stockraising production on the basis of closer integration with social production. These farms are slow in building up the output of meat and milk, the headcount of livestock kept by the population is declining, and consumer cooperatives' work on procuring surplus stock-raising production, processing it, and taking it to the consumer is poorly organized. Work on the fulfillment of the demands raised by the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum on this question is being done extremely slowly.

The unsatisfactory use of economic levers in the sector's development is linked with substantial errors in the work of the oblast soviet, its ispolkom, (Comrade Kurakin), and its agro-industrial organs.

The existence of serious shortcomings and omissions in stockraising is also the result of superficial and incompetent leadership by the CPSU obkom. No constant, persistent work is being done in the oblast to retain cadres in the countryside. Stock units alone are short of about 4,000 workers in the mass trades. At the same time, questions concerning the countryside's social development are resolved at a level that is considerably below the existing potential. There is chronic nonfulfillment of plans for the commissioning of preschool institutions, clubs, and culture centers, and the volume of housing construction on farms has declined. The oblast's powerful material potential is not operating properly to overcome lagging in the countryside's economic and social development and to secure the introduction of mechanization and automation in agricultural production.

In 1986-1987, just as in the past, there was frequent and unjustified turnover of party, soviet, and economic organ leaders, and educational work was supplanted by administrative edict methods and numerous party and administrative requirements. There is, just as in the past, unjustified overregulation of kolkhoz and sovkhoz activities. Instead of lively organizational work, all sorts of sessions, conferences, and hearings are held at oblast and local level. The apparatus of the CPSU obkom, the oblispolkom, the oblast agroprom, and the rayon agro-industrial associations wastes much of its time on preparations for these events, collecting information, drafting resolutions and telegrams, and so on, and gives insufficient assistance to labor collectives in their practical work and in the mastering of economic management methods by leaders and specialists. Secretaries of the obkom, of many party gorkoms and raykoms, and of primary party organizations and leaders of soviet and economic organs still have not fully understood the importance of the transition to new methods of leadership of agriculture, have not fully realized the depth of

the economic reform being implemented in the country, and have not satisfactorily organized the preparation of farms for work in the conditions of full economic accountability [khozaschet] and self-financing. The role of primary party organizations in the implementation of set tasks has been diminished.

The CPSU Central Committee resolves:

To draw the attention of the Chelyabinsk CPSU Obkom Bureau and Oblispolkom to the intolerable delays in ensuring the elaboration of economic methods for the intensification of stockraising and their assimilation by kolkhozes, sovkhozes, and other agro-industrial complex enterprises, and in achieving on this basis the swiftest possible buildup of resources of meat, milk, and other products so as to satisfy the population's needs for them more fully through local production. Overcoming the lag in the stockraising sector must be perceived as an immediate and paramount task of the oblast party organization.

To warn Obkom First Secretary Comrade N.D. Shvyrev and Oblispolkom Chairman Comrade Ye. F. Kurakin that they are personally responsible for the implementation of specific measures for the maximum utilization of the advantages of economic reform and for ensuring stable and high rates of growth in stockraising output production.

In line with the demands of restructuring, the party obkom, gorkoms, and raykoms and primary party organizations must conduct the necessary organizational and political work to mobilize Communists and all stock unit workers to meet the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum demands regarding the swiftest possible buildup of food resources. For this purpose, and on the basis of accelerated development of social production, the utmost use must be made of the potential for applying cooperative principles and economic integration to the population's personal plots, consumer societies, and industrial enterprises' subsidiary rural shops. Their needs as regards the headcount of all types of livestock and poultry must be fully satisfied as from next year.

High standards of labor and technological discipline must be ensured in all links on whose work the successful conduct of proper wintering for the livestock depends. Concern must be shown primarily for proper working and living conditions for livestock breeders. Trade and cultural and consumer service organizations, the health services, and the potential of other national economic sectors must be involved in the solution of this task.

Feeds and their preparation and rational utilization must be the subject of special monitoring, and extravagance and waste must not be tolerated.

Greater demandingness must be exercised toward cadres at all levels as regards the practical assimilation of economic factors for the intensification of stockraising, and their work must be assessed not only in terms of the quantity of output produced but also in terms of production costs. Advantage must be taken everywhere of the winter period for the mass training of stock unit workers and of specialists and leaders in economic methods of work and advanced technologies. The aim must be the actual assimilation of contract forms of labor organization, economic accountability [khozaschet], and efficient work by every production subdivision. Attitude to the practical assimilation of economic methods of management must be used to judge the actual political and organizational qualities of leadership cadres. There must be a fundamental change in attitudes to party, soviet, and economic organ cadres, there must be no unjustified turnover among them, and there must be a particularly solicitous attitude to specialist cadres, kolkhoz chairmen, and sovkhoz directors while raising their responsibility for meeting set targets in terms of output production and cost reduction. Persistent and patient work must be done among them to cultivate their political and professional qualities and the enterprise and initiative that correspond with the demands of restructuring.

There must be skillful combination of economic and political methods of leadership. There must be utmost development of democracy in management, working and living conditions must be improved, political work with people must be developed, and their training must be improved. The oblast's working people must be constantly informed about the state of affairs in the agro-industrial complex and about progress in the fulfillment of the Food Program.

Pension for Kolkhoz Members Increased

PM080843 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 87
Morning Edition p3

[Unattributed report: "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium: On Further Improving Pensions for Kolkhoz Members and Their Families"]

[Text] In accordance with 27th CPSU Congress decisions and in order to gradually narrow the difference between pensions for kolkhoz members, workers, and employees, a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree of 3 December 1987 raises the minimum pension for kolkhoz members and their families designated in the USSR Law "On Pensions and Allowances for Kolkhoz Members."

The minimum retirement pension is set at R40 per month, or R50 per month for pensions paid for at least 10 years.

The minimum pension for disablement resulting from injury at work or occupational disease is set at the following levels: disablement pension Group 1: R75;

disablement pension Group 2: R40, or R50 for pensions paid for at least 10 years; disablement pension Group 3: R21 per month, or R30 per month for pensions paid for at least 10 years.

The minimum pension for disablement resulting from general illness is set at the following levels: Group 1: R75; Group 2: R40, or R50 per month for pensions paid for at least 10 years.

The minimum pension for the families of kolkhoz members is set at the following levels: for three or more disabled family members: R75; for two disabled family members: R40, or R50 for pensions paid for at least 10 years; for one disabled family member: R25, or R28 per month for pensions paid for at least 10 years.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree will be effective from 1 January 1988.

Scientific

'Cosmos-1901' Satellite Launched

LD141531 Moscow TASS in English 1530 GMT
14 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 14 TASS—Today the Soviet Union blasted off another satellite "Cosmos-1901" to continue space explorations. It was put into orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution—89.8 minutes, apogee—376 km, perigee—181 km, orbital inclination—65 degrees. Instrumentation installed aboard the satellite operates smoothly.

Activities on 'Mir' Space Station Detailed LD151216 Moscow TASS in English 1212 GMT 15 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Yuriy Romanenko has been for 312 days in an orbital flight. Aleksandr Alexandrov's 21st week of work in orbit is drawing to a close. While unloading the automatic freight ship "Progress-33" and doing preventive maintenance work, the crew continue carrying out planned scientific and technological research.

On December 12 the cosmonauts launched a series of experiments to determine directly aboard the station the state of various materials subjected to open space impact. The specimens of structural materials and thermal insulation coatings under study are exposed in a sluice chamber, and controlled with the help of the improved "electrotopograph" equipment.

The cosmonauts continue astrophysical research, using the ultraviolet telescope Glazar. Yesterday, they made a survey of separate sections of the celestial area near Alpha Columba, and the Lepus constellation was chosen as an object of observations for today.

Using the Svetobloc-T unit the cosmonauts are carrying out an experiment the aim of which is synthesis of polyacrylamide gel necessary for perfecting the technology of obtaining biologically active compounds in terrestrial conditions.

The schedule for today provides for a series of measurements of streams of high-energy particles in the near-earth outer space, experiments to determine dynamic characteristics of the compound orbital complex.

According to the plan of work with the freight ship "Progress-33," the tanks of the basic unit are being refilled with fuel and oxidizer.

The flight of the manned complex "Mir" is proceeding normally.